

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 25 OCTOBER 1949**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

---

**TUESDAY, 25 OCTOBER, 1949.**

---

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. S. J. Brassington, Fortitude Valley) took the chair at 11 a.m.

**QUESTION.**

DOMESTIC SCIENCE AND TRADE CLASSES,  
EAST BRISBANE STATE SCHOOL.

**Mr. LUCKINS** (Maree) asked the Secretary for Public Instruction.

“In view of the accommodation available at the East Brisbane State School, will he give further consideration to the proposal to institute the teaching of domestic science, wood and leather working classes at that school?”

**Hon. H. A. BRUCE** (The Tableland) replied—

“Approval generally has been given to the provision of manual training for boys and domestic science for girls of the sixth and seventh grades of schools conveniently situated with respect to East Brisbane State School, using accommodation that might be made available at that school. The matter has been referred to the Department of Public Works for consideration of the alterations that would be necessary.”

**PAPERS.**

The following papers were laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Report of the Public Service Commissioner for the year 1948-49.

Report of the Commissioner of Police for the year 1948-49.

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Audit Report on the Books and Accounts of the Queensland Coal Board from 1 January, 1949, to 3 September, 1949

**STATE HOUSING ACTS AND ANOTHER  
ACT AMENDMENT BILL.**

**THIRD READING.**

Bill, on motion of Mr. Power, read a third time.

# DISEASES IN STOCK ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

## THIRD READING.

Bill, on motion of Mr. Collins, read a third time.

## SUPPLY.

### RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE—ESTIMATES—FIRST AND SECOND ALLOTTED DAYS.

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Mann, Brisbane, in the chair.)

### ESTIMATES-IN-CHIEF, 1949-50.

#### EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE—HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR (BALANCE OF VOTE.)

**Hon. E. M. HANLON** (Ithaca—Premier) (11.6 a.m.): I move—

“That £7,671 be granted for ‘His Excellency the Governor (balance of vote)’.”

The total amount required for 1949-50 is £8,228 but as the Committee has already approved of the salary of the Aide-de-camp, amounting to £557, the balance required is £7,671. There is an increase in the vote, but it will be seen that it now includes the salary of the private secretary, which previously appeared in the schedule.

Items (His Excellency the Governor—Balance of Vote) agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

**Hon. E. M. HANLON** (Ithaca—Premier) (11.7 a.m.): I move—

“That £110 be granted for ‘Executive Council’.”

The vote shows an increase of £5 compared with the appropriation for 1948-49, which is due to the extra cost incurred in binding the minutes of the Executive Council.

Vote agreed to.

#### LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

**Hon. E. M. HANLON** (Ithaca—Premier) (11.8 a.m.): I move—

“That £47,398 be granted for ‘Legislative Assembly’.”

The vote shows an increase of £2,956 over the appropriation for 1948-49. Salaries show an increase of £331 and contingencies £2,625. The cost of “Hansard” and other printing is much greater now than it was because of the increase in the cost of paper and other things. The vote for the Refreshment Rooms shows a decrease this year but last year it was necessary to expend a certain sum of money in buying crockery and other requirements. The amount is down this year by £700. The allowance to members for postage and telegrams is reduced by £50 as compared with 1948-49. The amount required for gas for Parliamentary buildings is also down, by £80. The amount required for railway passes

for members and ex-members of Parliament is down by £125, the reduction being on account of the death of ex-members during the year.

**Mr. H. B. TAYLOR** (Hamilton) (11.10 a.m.): I desire to make some comments on this vote particularly in relation to the Parliamentary Library. I want to refer to the main purpose of this library and to the accommodation that is provided, and to offer some constructive suggestions, and possibly some constructive criticism, for the benefit of the new Library Committee, which will come into being with the election of the next Parliament. Any criticism I have to offer will not include criticism of the staff. I do want to express my personal appreciation of the assistance I had from members of the parliamentary staff because with their assistance I have learned a great deal about parliamentary procedure and I have gained a great deal of knowledge from books available in the Parliamentary Library. This House is indebted to the splendid services that the staff, under the guidance of Mr. Ryan, the Librarian, has given to hon. members.

My first impression on entering the Parliamentary Library after my election to Parliament was one of pride at such an excellent display of books, and to one who had been a soldier for so many years the regimentation of the books on the shelves was very pleasing, for there was never a book out of place. The binding of them all too was in such good condition that it seemed as if they were rarely disturbed but I found that it was due to the system that prevailed there. If hon. members go into the library even now and look on the southern side they will see hundreds of books on the shelves but it is extremely difficult without the assistance of the librarians to know what help can be gained from them. I wanted very much to improve my knowledge by the use of the Parliamentary Library. I can recall the reputation the late Hon. Mick Kirwan had after his entry into this Parliament. When I was an apprentice clerk in the Railway Department he was foreman porter on the Central Station and immediately after his election by defeating the late Hon. E. B. Forrest for the seat of Brisbane, he quickly established a reputation for improving his knowledge. That was obtained by his devoting so much of his time to reading in the library. He was an outstanding example of a man who in his ordinary work had little opportunity of gaining knowledge of parliamentary practice but in the long run gained a very sound knowledge of Parliament and of being able at any time to quote references of value. I therefore tried to copy that example and immediately began to investigate the availability of books in the library.

This library of ours, as most hon. members know, is housed chiefly on this floor with shelves of books reaching to the ceiling. There is another library upstairs, but I wonder how often it is visited by hon. members. The main repository of bound volumes seems to be over in the stables. I often visualise the days when our grandfathers sat in this Chamber, housing their horses and

carriages in those stables, and wonder what they would think if they could see the stables filled with books. Should not the Government be rather ashamed that they have no better repository for the valuable collection of books than the stables that were previously occupied by the horses?

**Mr. Keyatta:** It is only a temporary measure.

**Mr. H. B. TAYLOR:** I am glad to have the interjection of the hon. member for Townsville that it is only a temporary measure; but to my knowledge it has been a temporary measure for a long time.

I am very happy indeed that today, because of the training of our Librarian, there is some effort to present books to members in a modern fashion. Authors write books after a great deal of research, in the hope that the knowledge contained in them will be spread among the people; but because of the inaccessibility of books, to which I referred previously, the dissemination of that knowledge has probably been difficult. Today, fortunately, the Librarian is setting out in shelves the designation of books and the classification of books, and members have the opportunity, without bothering the staff of going round and seeing for themselves what books are on the shelves. There is undoubtedly an attempt to present books to members in a way that enables them to make their selections without reference to the staff, although there is still a tendency to use the staff as "fetch and carry" boys.

I feel, however, that the circumstances under which members can select the books are extremely difficult. For instance, I was having a look only this morning at the classifications already shown of such things as biographies—in which I am personally interested—English history, psychology, agriculture—in which many members are interested—economics and education. These are on shelves almost to the ceiling. One has to use the ladder, which resembles a fire-escape ladder. I climbed the ladder once and I felt I needed a safety rope suspended from the ceiling to make sure I did not fall. It may be that I shall not climb that ladder again; but the staff should not be there merely to scale these ladders at the beck and call of members.

**Mr. Roberts:** They are doing a wonderful job just at present with the Dewey classification of books.

**Mr. H. B. TAYLOR:** The Dewey classification has been in a long time, and it is a very good method of letting members know where books are. If they know that the biographies are under 920 and that psychology and other things come under different numbers, they can go to those numbers and see for themselves.

I think it desirable first to give members an idea of what the functions of a parliamentary library really are. I can quote no higher authority than Mr. Kenneth Binns. I had the pleasure of meeting him at Canberra on his retirement from the library of the Commonwealth Parliament. In a report to

the Premier of Tasmania he described the functions of a parliamentary library as follows:—

- “(a) To assist members in the performance of their legislative and administrative duties, by providing books and information on required subjects;
- (b) To keep members informed and up to date on matters of general public interest and particularly in as far as they relate to the State, the Empire and international relations.

There is also the wide field of subjects affecting the interests and lives of those constituents whom the member represents.

- (c) To provide recreational and general reading for members and also for officials of Parliament.”

This has been a traditional function of all British Legislatures and is based on the practice of the Library of the House of Commons.

There has been a great deal of discussion on the subject of libraries since the visit to Australia in 1947 of Mr. Lionel R. McColvin, librarian of the city of Westminster. He was of the opinion that Parliamentary Libraries should be merely a branch of State Libraries. Mr. Frazer, the Parliamentary Librarian of Victoria, in talking with me, contested that opinion very strongly. Mr. McLoskey, Parliamentary Librarian of New South Wales, got into quite a heated argument with Mr. McColvin in the columns of the "Australian Quarterly." Mr. McLoskey quoted W. Ivor Jennings, an eminent constitutional authority, in his "Parliamentary Reform 1934," on the subject of Parliamentary libraries. He suggests that a Parliamentary library should provide for a really first-class library especially on commercial, economic and constitutional questions, adding that—

“It should be one of the functions of Parliament to inform its own members. The library staff should, therefore, be able to produce information on any topic with which the House, or a Committee thereof, is dealing.”

On that point I have a suggestion to offer to the incoming Library Committee. I wonder, Mr. Mann, whether we realise that in the next House there will be 13 new members. There will be also new members who will probably replace members on the Government side. That will add to the number of people who will desire to use the library. As the library is arranged at present, if these parliamentary members become library-conscious—as I hope they will—there will be considerable congestion. We can all see that because of the modernisation of the library over the past two or three years by Mr. Ryan, additional further fixtures have been placed on the floor and today one has to dodge between tables, chairs, racks, and staff to get at the books on the fixtures. That is not conducive to the best interest of members who seek to gather the information they desire. Consequently,

I make the recommendation to the Government that in the next Parliament the whole of the Library Committee should be asked to visit the Parliamentary libraries at Sydney, Canberra and Melbourne, see the lay-out of those libraries with a view of forming an opinion as to how much better our own library can be laid out in the future.

The first thing that appeals to one in those southern libraries is the accessibility of books. In the Federal parliamentary library shelves are no more than head-high and in Melbourne I was particularly impressed by the arrangements made for members who desire to do research by the provision of a silence room—it is definitely meant to be a silence room. The value of that silence room is appreciated when Bills are before the House and when the House is sitting.

We have the opportunity of doing something here immediately. In this building is the old Legislative Council Chamber, which appears to me to be used mainly for Government Caucus meetings once a week.

**Mr. Bruce:** And committee meetings.

**Mr. H. B. TAYLOR:** It is used also by Ministers and certain committees, but in my opinion it is vacant for the greater part of the time and could be put to better use. It is never likely to be used again as a Legislative Council Chamber and if it was converted into a modern Parliamentary Library reading room, with head-high shelving and with various bays with some opportunity for members to sit in quiet and study the books there, and if, during the session when legislation of a particular kind was before the House, the librarians had arranged on a special table all the literature applying to that particular legislation, I feel that not only new members coming into this Parliament but many of the older ones would become more library-conscious and would be encouraged to go into the Library and study the subject matter of the legislation before the House. There is any amount of material in the Chamber that could be available if members knew it was there, and if provision was made for the purpose in the new lay-out in the old Council Chamber so that we could do away with the stables, or reconstruct them and use them only for those reports that are rarely required. We should by this means make a better contribution to the consideration of our legislation.

Here I wish to quote again from the observations of Kenneth Binns of parliamentary libraries. The following is an extract from a lecture he gave some years ago:—

“From my own experience I would say that there are two distinct sides to the work of parliamentary libraries—the factual and the cultural. The nature and range of the factual is determined very much by the scope of the legislation of the parliament which each library serves. Thus, for example, in the Commonwealth National Library, international relations naturally bulk much larger than with State parliamentary libraries, but the latter have a much

wider range of domestic and technical matters on which material must be gathered and information provided. The educational and cultural aspect, however, should not be overlooked, and my experience is that members appreciate and respond to any guidance and help in regard to their general reading.”

I feel that if we members of this Chamber appreciate the library in the way in which Mr. Binns explained it in that lecture we should be more library-conscious.

In conclusion I emphasise my appreciation of the help the staff have given us. I urge the incoming committee to make some arrangements so that better facilities will be provided for those of us who like to browse quietly through the books on the shelves without having to climb fire-escape ladders to get the books we want.

I urge the Government to send the incoming Parliamentary Library Committee to the South because I do not think we can appreciate just how far behind modern requirements our present library is until we see the provision made in other States. I urge the incoming committee to consider that point very seriously. If its members see what is taking place elsewhere they will have a better appreciation of what might be made available in this State. I also urge the incoming Parliamentary Library Committee to request the Government to give consideration to the enlargement of our library by turning the present Legislative Council Chamber into a more modern Parliamentary Library. That Chamber is ideally suited for the system of having various bays of books, tables and comfortable accommodation, and particularly for the silence that an hon. member wants when studying a particular subject relative to legislation. If hon. members will give a greater degree of attention to the knowledge available to them in our library I feel their approach to the legislation that comes before this Chamber will be so much improved that it will be for the betterment of the people of the State.

**Hon. S. J. BRASSINGTON** (Fortitude Valley—Mr. Speaker) (11.32 a.m.): I should like to offer a few comments upon the remarks made by the hon. member for Hamilton, and to begin by remarking that his comments were like the curate's egg—good in parts. He offered some sensible advice on library matters but parts of his speech were not as practical as they might have been.

I should like to convey to members some idea of the present condition of the Parliamentary Library and say that there has not been a classification of its books since approximately 1900. There are between 70,000 and 80,000 books in the library and over that long period of time books have been accumulating with no proper classification, with the result that we do not know what books are in the library nor their value and we do not know how it is operating. I pride myself on being a good reader. Before coming to this Chamber I had very few opportunities for study but since then I have used

the library and have always had a warm regard for it. When I became Speaker of the Legislative Assembly I wrote to Mr. Binns for information on the situation, pointing out that many books were unclassified. That gentleman very kindly came all the way from Canberra to have a look at our library and told us that as a Parliamentary Library it was the worst in Australia. Another famous librarian, in the person of Mr. Metcalfe, said that our library would not make a decent school of arts. I felt it incumbent upon me, realising the value of the library to this Parliament and to the people of the State and knowing its shortcomings, to see that something should be done to put it upon a satisfactory basis. Acting upon Mr. Binn's report I took with me to Sydney a very good reader, in the person of Mr. Duggan, the present Minister for Transport, who has interested himself in this matter. We met the leading authorities on library matters in Canberra, Sydney and Melbourne and Mr. Duggan made a report on our investigations. We decided as the result of our investigations that little or no progress could be made in putting the library on a satisfactory basis until all the works were classified. The work of classification is now under way and there is a fairly big staff in the library. They are competent to do the work but I am told that at the present rate of progress little or no impression will be made before 10 years have passed. We were so far behind with this work that very little progress will be made until these competent members of the staff have been at the task for about 10 years.

I should like to impress on hon. members that the library is a very valuable asset to them, indeed a priceless possession. In the past it had been allowed to degenerate into a hopeless position but that is being rectified. It will take some years of hard and patient work before that can be accomplished. However, we hope then to have a library that is the equal of any State library in Australia if not of the library at Canberra. The material is there; it is a well-stocked library of splendid books. In the past, because of the lack of classification we did not know where many of the books were, or what the library really contained and, of course, that situation did not encourage hon. members to use the library to get the material they needed.

The hon. member for Hamilton spoke about having to climb ladders. All I can say at the moment is that this is not the time for additional improvements here, that there are more urgent works to be done outside. At the moment we are concentrating on a proper classification of the books so as to give hon. members a library service to which they are entitled.

I sincerely hope that hon. members will use the library as much as possible, because there they will find the greatest treasures available to them—books that will be sources of interest and recreation as well as a help in the discharge of their parliamentary duties. For many years a very venerable hon. member of this Chamber, the late Charles Collins, used the library gener-

ously, both while he was a member and when he was out of the Chamber. I also used the library during the time that I was not a member of Parliament and I know what a benefit it was to me. That is why I suggest that hon. members should use it as much as possible. It contains works on every subject and it is gradually coming to the stage when it will be the most up-to-date library in Australia.

The hon. member for Hamilton spoke about using the Legislative Council Chamber, but I could not agree with his suggestion. The parliamentary buildings are the most venerable buildings in Queensland, and the most beautiful buildings, too. The architectural design of the Legislative Council Chamber is a sheer delight, and it would be inadvisable to obscure its beauty by converting it to a use other than its present one.

I want to tell the hon. member that the Legislative Council Chamber is very useful for many purposes. It is used as a Government party room. It is also used for the purpose of extending a welcome to prominent visitors to the State. I could give a number of instances in which it was used to meet very distinguished gentlemen from other States who visited Queensland to discuss matters of importance to the State. It has been used also for sittings of Royal Commissions. Lastly, but not least, hon. members know that it was used only recently for historic purposes when the Governor-General of the Commonwealth, Mr. McKell, decorated a number of war heroes.

**Mr. H. B. Taylor:** That could have been done at Government House.

**Mr. BRASSINGTON:** Where would the hon. member suggest that it could have been done—out in the yard, or down on the river bank? The Chamber is there and it is used for very many important gatherings. I do not want to see it tampered with structurally, or its beautiful architecture interfered with in any way whatsoever.

Today our Parliamentary Library staff are doing a good job and are making steady but sure progress in the reclassification and cataloguing of the library books. If we compare the position today with that which has existed for many years, it must be admitted that we are now making splendid progress. If we continue along present lines then, the time is not far distant when we shall be able to pride ourselves on possessing one of the best parliamentary libraries in Australia.

**Mr. BRAND (Isis) (11.42 a.m.):** Undoubtedly this vote is one that interests every hon. member. We must remember that it concerns the Parliament of Queensland.

If we compare the cost of running the Parliament of Queensland with other Parliaments we must admit that the comparison is very favourable. I was particularly interested to hear Mr. Speaker's comments on the parliamentary building and library and the very constructive suggestions made by the hon. member for Hamilton. It is due to all hon. members to say that Mr. Speaker

has endeavoured to improve the privileges that hon. members enjoy in this Parliament. He has been the essence of kindness and has done much to help hon. members in the discharge of their particularly onerous duties as representatives of the people. I feel sure that the Government of the day will realise that they should, in the interests of Parliament, make available the finance necessary for the proper conduct of Parliament.

We know that considerable interest has been shown by Mr. Speaker and the Library Committee to make improvements in the library for the convenience and benefit of hon. members, and in that way to enable them to enjoy this splendid privilege associated with Parliament. The hon. member for Hamilton is to be complimented on introducing the matter. A good library is absolutely essential for the good working of Parliament. However, I cannot agree with the hon. member for Hamilton's suggestion that the Legislative Council Chamber should be converted into a reading room and an annexe to the library. It is essential for Parliament to have both the Legislative Assembly and Legislative Council Chambers to carry out their functions. I know of no better room, or a more convenient room, for the conduct of the business of the Government party than the Legislative Council Chamber. After all, any party that is governing the State must have its party meetings. All Parties have meetings and it is essential that meetings of the Government Party should take place in a convenient room, and I know of no other room in this building in which the Government party could hold its caucus meeting.

Mr. Speaker has made reference to the many occasions on which Parliament would be called upon to have social meetings, particularly in regard to visits of Governors and on any occasion when members of the Royal Household may visit this State. Possibly in about 12 or 18 months' time Their Majesties themselves may come to Queensland. I think the room mentioned should be kept for the purpose Parliament has already recognised, which is necessary to the carrying out of the full duties of Parliament.

During the period I have been a member of this House I have visited other Parliaments and I think this is the best conducted Parliament of any that I have visited. Speaking generally, members recognise their duties to Mr. Speaker and the Chairman of Committees. There have been very few brawls in this Parliament over the last 30 or 40 years, and, generally speaking, this Parliament conducts its debates in a way that reflects credit on the representatives of the people.

I notice that many of the amounts in the list of expenditure are smaller this year than in the year just closed. We know that we have already made provision for an increase in the number of members, but probably that will not take place till April or May next. I think the amount that we are appropriating is very small and most of these items will be exceeded. For instance, the allowance to members for postage and

telegrams is estimated to be smaller this year than the amount expended last year; the same applies to the Refreshment Rooms and some other items. Looking down the schedule of all the costs, in comparison with other Parliaments, Queensland is very conservative in this respect. The number of hands on the staff is small in comparison with other Parliaments, which is possibly due to the fact that we are only a one-Chamber Parliament; nevertheless that is a fact and should be made known to the people because, generally speaking, the average elector feels that very little is done for the money provided for Parliament, and that members do very little work for their allowances. I doubt whether there is a body of men to be found in Queensland who give more attention to the business for which they have been elected than members of the Queensland Parliament. In that respect we are doing a very good job.

The Parliamentary Refreshment Rooms have been the subject of criticism from time to time but ever since I have been a member of Parliament our Refreshment Rooms have shown a loss on the year's trading. This is not peculiar to the Queensland Parliament. All Parliaments in the British Empire are in the same position. The Refreshment Rooms in the House of Commons and in the Australian National Parliament show losses annually, but none shows up so favourably as our own in the small sum lost. Generally speaking, all members of this Parliament, irrespective of party, desire to pay exactly the same price for a meal as a similar meal can be obtained for in the city proper, that is, a price equivalent to the worth of the meal provided. Members of Parliament cannot be held to blame for the losses on trading shown by the Refreshment Rooms. Apparently it is recognised by all Parliaments that the refreshment rooms attached to Parliamentary buildings will show a loss, but these amenities are necessary in the interests of the good government of the country, as are other amenities and conveniences provided for members.

In the past few years there has been an attempt in Queensland to improve these amenities and conveniences and as a member of Parliament of long standing I take this opportunity of thanking Mr. Speaker for the courtesies he has extended to me in the exercise of my privileges as a member of this Parliament. These are valued privileges and I hope that at all times they will be protected by members of Parliament, whoever they may be.

**Mr. DUNSTAN** (Gympie) (11.54 a.m.): Having over the years made a number of speeches on the Library vote and having this morning listened to the speeches of Mr. Speaker and the hon. member for Hamilton, I am encouraged to say a few words both on the Library vote and about other amenities provided in this House.

The need and value of the Parliamentary Library must be related to the finance available to this Assembly. For many years the Library was a show place to which representatives brought their friends or constituents

who visited Parliament for the purpose of showing them the fine library of the Queensland Parliament. It was filled from floor to ceiling with beautifully bound books, all in uniform binding. Now that we have introduced a new form of classification and the Librarian and his staff are recataloguing the volumes in the library, we find that all these beautifully and uniformly bound books on the shelves of the library are being disturbed and the show place does not look so showy as it used to do.

The local member bringing in his friends from his electorate would say, "What do you think of that library? We house about 75,000 books and they are insured for a very heavy sum." They would say, "It is beautiful," because they had looked at the bindings. Most of the members of Parliament also looked at the bindings. Over the years I have seen very few of the members of Parliament climb even the half-ladder, let alone the long one, to look at the books on the top shelf. For myself, without any desire to be an entomological specimen, or a book moth or beetle, I used to browse and probe amongst those dust-covered volumes on the upper shelves and had the good fortune on one occasion to find a book that was not even in the original catalogue or any subsequent catalogue. It was entitled, "The Laws of King Hamurabi," an old intelligent and wise man who preceded Moses. In that I found a very close identity in many respects with our laws and the laws of the Romans with the laws of King Hamurabi. However, I do not wish to exalt the importance of the Library beyond its deserts. I do not want to exalt it as an institution that is beyond the demands of the members of this Parliament. I have to confess that I have found in this Parliament many hon. members who are not readers at all.

The main value of the Library is its accessibility to its reference books, the ease with which members can get information and the assistance of the Librarian with extracts and references that enable him to make a speech in this Chamber. That is very valuable. The classification that is going on now under Mr. Ryan and his staff, very competently indeed, also will have a value. But there is still the difficulty of getting further accommodation for the needs of the library. As every hon. member knows, this Parliamentary building in Queensland architecturally is one of the best in Australia and it is difficult to disturb that architecture in order to provide better accommodation for the Library. It is all right to have a room where you can browse and even sleep in comfort, with books on shelves or racks head-high, but to have a library of the dimensions of this one with books head-high would require more than double our present space.

It has been said that we should include the Legislative Council Chamber within the library accommodation but there are many objections to that. Hon. members will observe that within the Library there is splendid interior decoration done by craftsmen of the past. As Mr. Speaker has said,

the Council Chamber has been used since the days of the old regime for party meetings, committee meetings, reception of royalty and vice-royalty, commissions, and other bodies, and indeed has been a very useful Chamber. But it had a still further use. A little while ago, as the Premier and other hon. members will recall, a meeting of the Youth Parliament was held in the Legislative Council Chamber, and a very fine gathering it was too. When I saw those young men and women I became rather dismayed and I passed the remark that it seemed to me like a new invasion and that we older members would soon be amongst the displaced persons. However, in the remote future, in the cool, calm and sequestered vale of private life, I hope that I shall be able to come along to the Library as an ex-member of Parliament, browse amongst its books and ruminate upon the subjects contained within them. As it is, it is a fine library. When the new cataloguing system is completed it will be very good.

I should like to see amongst hon. members of Parliament the growth of the desire for culture and reading. There is ample room for that in the Library. I compliment the new Librarian, Mr. Ryan, upon his work, and the staff upon their work of recataloguing. I am satisfied that when the cataloguing is completed—and it will take a long time to do—we shall, if we can get further accommodation, have all we desire.

**Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra)** (12.4 p.m.): I join with other hon. members who have paid a compliment to the Librarian and his staff for the opportunities provided to hon. members for increasing their store of knowledge. In these fast-moving times, blaring radio and talkies, and various other diversions, reading is a habit that, like all other habits, must be cultivated if it is to become part and parcel of one's life. You cannot just say, "I am going to read certain books, I am going to improve my knowledge, and I am going culturally to advance myself," and decide to do it when you have some spare time. In these fast-moving days there is no such thing as spare time. So that you will have to sacrifice something before you can become a reader. If you want to be a reader you have to sacrifice other pleasures and diversions. We cannot take a book home from the Parliamentary Library and expect to read it, if we are going to turn on the wireless at 7 o'clock at night and leave it on through the whole blasted gamut of Mo McCackie, Bob Dyer, Big Sister, and the various other things that come over the air. You have to sacrifice something if you want to become a reader. I cultivated the habit in my early days, and I have always thought that it was worth while any sacrifice I made.

As the Minister for Transport once said of me, I am an omnivorous reader, a very voracious reader, and my reading tastes are very catholic. I read anything from Who-dunits to the Classics. There is a great deal of truth in the old axiom that variety is the



spice of life. I get mental rest and relaxation from a heavy book by reading a Shoot-'em-down and I sometimes read a Wild West yarn.

**Mr. H. B. Taylor:** And the comic strip?

**Mr. AIKENS:** No, not the comic strip, particularly if it is the American comic strip. My mind has not become so debased that I have got down to reading the American comic strip.

I do pay a tribute to the Librarian and those who have been responsible for building up the Parliamentary Library. I shall of course be here for very many years in which to enjoy the privilege that it bestows on members of Parliament.

I was rather amused by an interjection the hon. member for Townsville made while the hon. member for Hamilton was saying that the old stables were used as a storehouse for some of the volumes from the Parliamentary Library. The hon. member for Townsville interjected that the stables were used only as a temporary measure, which reminds me of an old friend of mine employed in the Brilliant Extended Mine at Charters Towers for 26 years. When the mine petered out, he was told, "Jim, we are afraid you will have to go," to which he replied, "Well, what do you know about that? If I had known that it was only to be a temporary job I would not have taken it." The old stables are a fairly substantial structure and a building that will compare favourably, if not more than favourably, with 95 per cent. of the buildings in Brisbane and I see no objection whatever to its being used for its present purpose. Everything put there from the Library is properly catalogued, and documented, not thrown in in a higgledy-piggledy manner. I have had occasion from time to time to ask a member of the staff to get me some paper, book or document from the storehouse in the stables, and within a few minutes the Librarian was able to hand me that book, paper or document. So that the mere fact that the building was once used as a stable does not make it an unfit place to store books of the Parliamentary Library.

**Mr. H. B. Taylor:** And they often go over to the stables in the rain to get the books.

**Mr. AIKENS:** Yes.

Like every other officer in the parliamentary buildings, the Parliamentary Library staff set a very high standard of courtesy and service to hon. members. I doubt whether there is an institution anywhere in Australia whose officers and employees set a higher standard of service and courtesy. Parliament is essentially a British institution that grew up away back in the dim distant years of history until it reached its present form. Over the years various political parties have sought to dodge and to get round parliamentary forms and procedure by redistributing seats to favour themselves and holding pre-selection plebiscites, crooked and faked. Various political parties have done these

things in an endeavour to avoid the fundamentals of the parliamentary system. Nevertheless Parliament persists as it is today and the Queensland Parliament is not any worse in that regard than any other Parliament in Australia. It is true that there exist flim-flams and flummeries and many futile formalities or formal futilities that have come down from distant ages, their origins lost in obscurity. Much of the procedure in this Parliament is an anachronism and does not belong to this age. It has been inherited from Parliaments of the past.

I want to touch on one anachronism as I see it. I cannot see why it is so, and why this practice exists in this 20th century, which allegedly believes in the emancipation of women and believes, and as I believe, that a woman is equal in every respect to a man. We know that in this Parliament men can, if they wish, go unreservedly up into the public gallery and women who come here with friends, or come by themselves, can go up into the ladies' gallery. We know that some people, at the discretion of the Speaker, which is widely and generously exercised can go up into the Speaker's gallery. At other times men can go into the lobbies of Parliament itself, which are merely divided from the Legislative Assembly by the Bar. People waiting to see a Minister on any matter affecting their electorate or any matter at all, can sit in the right-hand lobby just as those gentlemen are sitting there now or other men can be brought up to this floor by hon. members and with the acquiescence of Mr. Speaker, which is generously given, can sit in the Speaker's lobby at the left-hand side of the Speaker's chair. But no woman can enter the Parliamentary lobby. If a woman by accident happens to enter the parliamentary lobby she is hustled out, and as quickly as possible, just as if she were something unclean. As a matter of fact, to bring a woman into the lobby of this Assembly appears to be as dreadful as taking a ham into a synagogue.

Only the other day I saw one of our leading public servants bring a young girl into the lobby. It appeared to me that she was his daughter. She sat in the lobby. You would think someone had planted a bomb near Mr. Speaker's chair, judging by the way she was hustled out by the attendant. Quite recently I had occasion to introduce a woman, who lived in my electorate some time ago, to one of the Ministers. I arranged with the Minister for him to receive this woman on her business and he very courteously agreed to do so in the Cabinet room, just off the lobby. He said to me, "Tom, will you bring the lady in here?" Naturally I took the lady from the outside room into the lobby and, goodness me, one would think I was trying to take in a Churchill tank. We were hustled out into the passage and into the Minister's room through the back door. There may be some reason for that, and the reason may be lost in the mist of antiquity. It may be tradition. I believe it is the result of some custom that has been handed down

from time immemorial, but I do not know why it should exist in the 20th century. Perhaps the Premier knows the reason.

**Mr. Hanlon:** You would be surprised at what the Premier knows. (Laughter.)

**Mr. AIKENS:** The Premier is particularly versatile and acute. If he does not know the real reason he will quickly invent a damn good one. (Renewed laughter.)

It is one of those things we have inherited from the House of Commons but no-one seems to know why. Why on earth can I bring a man, as I and other hon. members have often done, with the acquiescence of Mr. Speaker, and seat him in the lobby on the floor of the House to listen to the debate and take a man across the corner of the lobby to interview a Minister, as I have often done, but cannot take a woman there?

Why can I not take a reputable and respectable woman into the lobby? Why cannot we take a woman across the lobby into the Ministerial room? Why must she be hustled through the outside passages and taken to the Ministers' room through the back door?

**Mr. Marriott:** Approaching the high altar.

**Mr. AIKENS:** I do not know whether it is a question of approaching the high altar or whether the lobby is sacrosanct. I think it is one of those old customs that are moth-eaten, threadbare with time, and covered with the cobwebs of history. It does cause considerable embarrassment. I am quite sure the high-ranking public servant—and I will mention his name: Colin Clark—was very embarrassed the other day when he sat with this young lady—I think it was his daughter—and they were hustled out and sent to the ladies' gallery to watch the proceedings. I too was very much embarrassed in the instance in which I was a party. I am not capable of much embarrassment where I am personally concerned—I am so used to taking so many things from members of the Labour Party that I am inured to it—but I felt embarrassed on this occasion. I said to the lady—it was the Minister for Transport who agreed to see us—"If you will go through here we will go to the Ministerial room," and my goodness, we met a veritable phalanx of messengers who said, "Holy smoke! you cannot go in through there; you cannot take a woman through here," and we were hustled round the other way. If someone will elucidate that incident for me I shall be particularly pleased.

I wish to pay tribute to the officers of the House, who are particularly courteous and helpful. They are uniformly so; there is no exception in any department of the House. I am sorry I cannot pay the same compliment to some members of the Government who occupy positions on various committees; still, being an honest man and used to speaking the truth, I cannot say anything if I do not think it is correct.

**Mr. DECKER (Sandgate) (12.18 p.m.):** This vote gives us an opportunity of expressing our appreciation of the parliamentary

staff. We are fortunate to have such a good staff, the Clerk of Parliament, the "Hansard" staff, the Library staff, and the Refreshment Rooms staff. In all these departments I believe that every member gets courtesy and attention, and we have this opportunity to express to the staff our appreciation of the service they have given to members and to Parliament.

Much has been said about the wonderful staff we have in the Library. I should like to draw the attention of members to the staff we have on "Hansard." I think we have a remarkable staff there. When we remember the disturbances that occur in debate here and the distance the staff are from the speaker, the accuracy of the reports and the speed with which it is transferred on to type-written sheets and sent over to the printer and later published in "Hansard," are indicative of the highest efficiency in all departments, from those who take the speeches down to those who finally do the printing. I will say this too—and members will agree with me—that when we get our proofs our remarks are accurately set out and it is only on rare occasions that an alteration has to be made, so close is the attention that is paid to the matter spoken and so accurate is the report that is taken.

We are suffering from difficulties that are common to the other States and the Commonwealth, that is, a shortage of accommodation, just as the outsider suffers in business or the person who needs a house. Members of this Parliament, particularly those of the Liberal Party, are very badly off as regards accommodation for the purpose of interviewing callers. The Liberal Party certainly has a room downstairs, to accommodate nine members. This is only a small room. We have no reception room in which to receive visitors or to discuss business with callers. These discussions have to be held in the room allotted to us downstairs and, as I said, it is sufficient to accommodate only about nine people. This is not a very satisfactory state of affairs, and it is time this Parliament recognised the need for a reception room in which individual members could discuss business with callers or visitors in some semblance of privacy.

Accommodation at the Parliamentary Lodge is at a premium nowadays, but in 1950, of the 13 new members to be elected to this Parliament nine will be representatives of country districts. An acute accommodation problem in housing these new country members faces this Parliament, but I take it the Government had this in mind. They must have given serious consideration to the housing of these extra nine country members. As the accommodation problem is acute at the present moment, there will have to be much thinking and planning before the next Parliament assembles to make certain that accommodation is available to these members.

**Mr. Brassington:** Ample provision exists, with the re-arrangement of accommodation in the Lodge, to house the extra nine country members.

**Mr. DECKER:** I am glad to have that assurance from Mr. Speaker.

There are other accommodation difficulties that face us, however. This morning the hon. member for Hamilton suggested that the Legislative Council Chamber might be used for a library. I do not approve of that idea. That Chamber is a magnificent room. It is architecturally perfect. Anybody could be proud of it. But in my opinion its beautiful features are wasted. Why are these architectural beauties hidden from the general public? Comparing the two Chambers, the Legislative Council Chamber and the Legislative Assembly Chamber, one notices a vast difference. It may be said that the Legislative Assembly Chamber is architecturally beautiful, but it cannot compare in any way with the architectural beauties of the Council Chamber at the far end of this building.

It is high time we did some thinking and sorting out of the accommodation on this floor. The Legislative Assembly should meet in the Legislative Council Chamber. That is the chamber that should be used for the meetings of the Legislative Assembly, and I say that advisedly. It may be said that the Council Chamber is used for caucus meetings, but there would be nothing to prevent caucus from meeting in it inasmuch as caucus does not meet when Parliament is sitting. It may also be said that the Council Chamber is required for meetings of the Cabinet, but alternative accommodation could be found for this purpose. It must not be overlooked that 72 members will attend the next session of Parliament whereas the number in Cabinet is comparatively small.

It is contended that the Legislative Council Chamber should be reserved for use on special occasions, such as a royal visit, presentation of medals or similar events, or some State functions, but these can take place in that Chamber even though it be used as the Legislative Assembly Chamber. All in all, it is my opinion that that magnificent Chamber should be used for meetings of the Legislative Assembly.

If we did that this Assembly Chamber would then be vacant and we should have an opportunity of rearranging it in such a way as would probably meet the accommodation needs of the House. In my opinion many changes can be made here without detracting from the architectural beauty of the building. We have good architects and draftsmen who could plan alterations in keeping with the existing building.

**Mr. Russell:** Would you use it for the Library then?

**Mr. DECKER:** I should not suggest that it be used for the Library because I think we could make some alterations to make better use of this floor without disturbing its architectural beauty and at the same time give more accommodation. There is no question that the Library is cramped for room, but even there hon. members would be surprised at what a good architect could do to make it better for library purposes. There are many ways in which that room could be

altered without great architectural disturbance, to accommodate the books in such a way that they would be only a little over head height and could be seen from the floor without the use of steps or ladders.

**Mr. Bruce:** There are plenty of people there to go up the ladder if necessary.

**Mr. DECKER:** Yes, but when the books are stacked so high one needs a telescope to read their titles.

**Mr. Bruce:** But if they are numbered and you know the number it is quite simple. That is what they have been doing now for months.

**Mr. DECKER:** But it must be remembered that when a man walks into the Library he does not like imposing on the staff; he likes to look round and see for himself the volumes that are there. Those books should be in clear view, and they would be if the Library was set out properly. We have a number of skilled men here who could submit good designs to bring that room more into keeping with modern requirements. If it was felt that we had not enough skill amongst our own architects, there would be nothing wrong with having a competition amongst architects outside the Public Service to see whether they could work out something that was satisfactory. I feel that we can meet our accommodation problems if we only have the determination to do so.

Let me make it clear that the suggestions offered are not put forward by way of criticism, but with a view to effecting improvements. I do not think anyone who has been a member of this Assembly could fail to appreciate the Library. It is an old-established Library, it is modern, it is big, it is up to date, and we can take pride in showing our friends the facilities we have there. We do not want to spoil its architectural beauty, but we should do something to overcome its cramped outlook by making better and more modern provision for displaying the volumes there.

It is not my desire to take up much time on this vote, but I did want to say a few words to the "Hansard" staff in particular, to the Clerk of Parliament and his assistants, to the Library staff and the Refreshment Rooms staff. I think we are all proud of the staff we have and the services they render.

**Mr. KEYATTA** (Townsville) (12.30 p.m.): Reference has been made to the temporary measure adopted by the Parliamentary Library Committee for the storing of certain books, papers, and reports. As hon. members are probably aware, these buildings are something like 80 years old, and the growth that has occurred in the interval was not anticipated in the original plans for the future. As the requirements of the library increased, particularly for the housing of papers and records, extra room had to be provided. A large room is set aside for the storage of books on the same floor as this Legislative Assembly Chamber and on the floor above two rooms are used for storage purposes. As a further temporary

measure, the old buildings across the way were set aside for the preservation of records. As time goes on, provision will probably be made by the Parliamentary Buildings Committee for the construction of a further wing, running parallel to the building itself and similar to the wing on the western side. When this construction is brought about it will enable the papers and records to be brought from their temporary accommodation to the main building so that all the library will be housed under the one roof.

**Mr. H. B. Taylor:** You mean an extension of this building?

**Mr. KEYATTA:** That has been considered. It is a matter for the Parliamentary Buildings Committee and I know that the Parliamentary Library Committee has discussed the question on those lines. Probably the future will bring about some alteration in that direction, but there is nothing wrong with the temporary housing accommodation now in existence. I do not know whether hon. members have visited that establishment—

**Mr. H. B. Taylor:** I have been in the stables.

**Mr. KEYATTA:** It is serving the purpose of accommodating the papers and records that will eventually be brought to this building. The hon. member for Gympie, who is also a member of the Library Committee, said that the architectural features of this building should be preserved. I merely rose as a member of the Parliamentary Library Committee to reply to what certain hon. members have said about the temporary housing of records, as I was surprised to hear the references made to the subject. I thought it was understood that the old buildings were being used as a temporary measure only.

**Mr. KERR (Oxley) (12.33 p.m.):** As the Premier pointed out, the Auditor-General's report is not yet available to Parliament, but will be made available in the near future. I can appreciate that Mr. Crosser is fastidious in the presentation of his report to Parliament, and as a fellow-auditor I commend him for taking full time on the job.

There is a note of grandeur and charm about our Library that appeals to me, and indeed to every visitor who has an opportunity of going over this building. It is a wonderful place and one of the outstanding amenities provided for the use and enjoyment of hon. members, when they get the time to enjoy browsing amongst the books. One's parliamentary duties take up one's time almost to the full, and as it is necessary to be present in the House when matters of State are being dealt with, an hon. member does not really get much time to take advantage of the opportunities the Library affords. I want to pay a compliment to the Library staff for their capable and efficient work and their courtesy to hon. members on all occasions.

Some years ago I was asked by a friend of mine to see whether I could dig up a poem written by a man named Schmid. The poem was called, "Tid Apa." It was

written in 1914 and was published in the Nineteenth Century Magazine. Schmid had travelled extensively in the East, he knew the topnotchers from Rangoon to China, from Japan to India. He had a peculiar turn of mind and he wrote this poem "Tid Apa," which, interpreted, means "Nothing matters." I always remember the first stanza particularly well. It runs like this—

"Do you know the graveyard at Aden,  
Lone tombs on a sun-parched plain—  
Treeless, lifeless and flowerless,  
Unkissed by God's kindly rain."

Hon. members can imagine the rhythm and poetic balance in those lines. Many years ago, when an old friend and I were together, we set about learning this long poem, stanza by stanza. When we were on the pearling schooner together we would recite it alternately, stanza by stanza. I lost touch with him for many years. Later on he became shire clerk of Tambo and from there he wrote me to see whether I could get the poem. I searched the book stalls and inquired of the book-sellers of Brisbane, but without avail. I then appealed to my brother, who was a member of this Parliament at the time and, lo and behold, it was brought to light. It is an outstanding poem and I am sure that the Treasurer with his poetic gift will appreciate what I say.

I should like a word now on the reporting staff. I have never looked upon myself as an outstanding speaker by any means. Frequently when I have read my speeches in proof form next day, after they had been sandpapered and polished by the reporting staff, I said to myself with pride, "My word, at last I've struck form; I can speak." Some hon. members are natural speakers, others have to force themselves to express themselves, if they are to deal with their subject in an aggressive way. Unfortunately I decided to take up the political occupation late in life and I found that it was like swimming and golfing—you can never become a good swimmer or golfer unless you start early in life.

I notice that the cost of printing "Hansard" remains much about the same. The Refreshment Rooms expenditure is down by about £500. I know that the Refreshment Room very rarely shows a profit and this reduction might help to bring the deficit down a little.

There are one or two other matters I should like to mention. We have not got an up-to-date copy of the statutes in our party room. The latest we have is for the period 1911. In the other party rooms the bound volumes have been brought up to 1936. Hon. members can appreciate the difficulty associated with work on amendments. First of all you must have the original statute before you and then all the amendments made since then. Even so there is the fear that one amendment may be missed or overlooked. One has to be very careful in ascertaining the exact meaning of a new amendment. One has to run through the original Act and all amendments. Even so, as I have said, one may be overlooked.

I do suggest that these statutes should be brought up to date. It is necessary in the interests of good government; It is only right that hon. members should have access to our statutes that have been brought up to date. I make a plea that the statutes should be brought up to date and made available to every party. I am sure that the Premier will see the justice of my request and I hope he will do something about it.

I do not know whether we are fortunate or unfortunate that we do not have our proceedings or selected parts of them broadcast. Quite a number of my friends and political enemies tell me of what they hear over the air as taking place in the Federal House. We might do something about broadcasting the proceedings of this Parliament. I am not suggesting that we should broadcast everything, but there are special Acts of Parliament and new legislation that comes before this Chamber, and probably the Address in Reply of the debates on which broadcasts might be arranged. We should give some consideration at any rate to broadcasting speeches in this Chamber. The people are entitled to know what is going on here. In the old days, some of the speeches made in Parliament were published in the papers almost verbatim, but today, because of demands on space, the Press selects only pithy points from speeches or condense them. That is all that appears about it. There should be times when speeches should be broadcast, but when the broadcast should take place should be arranged by agreement of both sides of the Chamber in order to eliminate any unfairness because the Government of the day selected the broadcasting period for the making of their speeches. I believe that such an incident as occurred last Tuesday night would not have happened if parliamentary proceedings were being broadcast. Hon. members would be put on their mettle and would do their best and not blurt out anything. We can all blurt out things at times that in other circumstances we should not blurt out. I remember an occasion when I blurted out something I should probably not have blurted out if my speech was being broadcast. I have deteriorated and only last week I used an expression, "gutzer," that I should not have dreamed of using in my early days in Parliament—not that I am a lilywhite, but because it was unethical. It is possible, too, that the use of such an expression grows on one after listening to hon. members on my left, it is possible that I became contaminated, and that I deteriorated. I want to mend my ways and get back to my old style of speech and of lofty ideals and thoughts. If we had our speeches broadcast from time to time it would have a restraining influence on all hon. members because knowing so many would be listening in a member would be very careful of what he said.

**Mr. RUSSELL (Dalby) (12.45 p.m.):** As a member of the Library Committee, I wish to make a few remarks on the Library; probably this is the last opportunity I shall have to do so.

On the subject of the Parliamentary Vote generally, I want to say how much I have appreciated the work of all the members in the various sections, and as a member of the Library Committee, I do want to express my appreciation of the staff there; they have done a very good job; and that applies not only to the staff but also to Mr. Speaker.

Library staff are hard to get and we have been extremely fortunate in getting a staff that are carrying out their duties in cataloguing and reorganising the library so well. I do want to pay a tribute too, to Mr. Speaker in this connection, who after all is the man at the top. I feel that if any credit is to be given it should first of all be given to the man at the top. Following the same principle and when we see the finances of the State going haywire, we can only blame the Treasurer. I think the organisation and administration of the Library generally is satisfactory, and we should give credit to Mr. Speaker. I am pleased the hon. gentleman spoke on this matter and gave us details of what is happening—he has left me little to say.

The Library here is very good—it is housed in a beautiful room but is cramped for space. I think some plans should be put into train to correct the shortcomings in this connection.

The Library exists to serve members of Parliament and to inform them generally. Many members of Parliament—and I include myself—are people who are not qualified in many things, and we have to be helped to find the knowledge that is there. In that respect the staff do a very excellent job. With the books stacked as high as they are, it is very difficult for people to see what they want and to find what they want.

**Mr. Aikens:** They are all catalogued.

**Mr. RUSSELL:** Yes, and it is all very well if you know where to go, but there are a number of us who do not know. If the books were brought down to eye level so that members could browse amongst them and help themselves it would be much better.

The accommodation is totally inadequate. I suppose the old stable provides adequate accommodation, but apart from the nature of the building, it is situated so far from the Library that there is a tremendous waste of time of the qualified staff, who have to run backwards and forwards and who are virtually "fetch and carry" boys. I hope the Government will give consideration to the building of a new wing. This becomes more essential now that Parliament is to be enlarged.

Obviously the space needed for a Library is continually growing. Apart from the accumulation of new books, daily metropolitan papers, papers from the various capital cities in Australia, and the London "Times" are bound and kept as permanent records; so the demand for more space is continually growing.

The increase in the Vote has been considerable. Five years ago it was £450, then it was increased to £950, and now it is £1,300. I

doubt very much whether the increase in the Vote has been in proportion to the cost of new books, which has risen enormously. It is unwise to stint the Library in this connection, because it must be kept up to date. This year 1,128 new books were placed in the Library, as compared with only 1,002 the year before.

The Librarian is subject to a great number of unusual requests, consequently he must be an expert in his job, and have a very good system of indexing. For the interest of hon. members I will read some of the unusual publications asked for. This list was given to me by the Librarian:—

Australian production and import and export of base metals.

Report to Department of Agriculture and Stock in 1870's on catarrh in sheep in Burnett district.

Circumstances surrounding enactment of Bill of Rights, and copy of Bill of Rights.

Reports of House of Commons Committee of Privilege in Sandys case.

Amount voted for education in Great Britain in 1832—first year of State aid.

Yalta, Potsdam agreements and Anglo-Soviet Treaty of Friendship.

Number of prisoners in Belsen prison camp, number destroyed, date of release, number released. (This for an officer of the Repatriation Department.)

Indian imports of goods produced by Australia.

North Queensland population during last 3 censuses.

Arrival of Fortitude in Brisbane and establishment of Fortitude Valley.

Commonwealth Patents Act and High Court decisions on prices of proprietary lines.

Communist doctrines and rebuttal.

Authoritative statements of effect of marriage between people of different races.

Public Service superannuation schemes in other States.

Method of financing fire brigades in New South Wales.

Circumstances surrounding gift of books by Queen Victoria to library.

Places where scholarship and junior examinations were held in 1910.

Colours of South Australian coat of arms. This gives some idea of the difficulty of the Librarian's job and I repeat that I compliment him on the work he has done. I have been very pleased to be associated with the Library.

This vote includes the item "Empire Parliamentary Association—contribution towards cost of publications." When visiting London recently I had the opportunity of visiting this association and I here pay tribute to the work done and the courtesies given to visiting parliamentarians.

Last but not least, I pay my tribute to the "Hansard" staff, who, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Oxley make a very

good job of some of our speeches. Like the hon. member I feel that I do not speak as well as their finished report would indicate. They do an excellent job, and at times I sympathise with them. Theirs must be a most difficult job.

In conclusion, I pay tribute to the whole of the Parliamentary staff.

**Mr. LUCKINS (Maree) (12.55 p.m.):** At the outset, I wish to pay my tribute to all associated with the Legislative Assembly, to the "Hansard" staff in particular. I feel, like my friend the hon. member for Oxley, they have many golden opportunities of recording our speeches and putting them into book form, and this is appreciated, I am sure, by all hon. members.

To the staff of the Legislative Assembly I express my appreciation and gratitude for the many courtesies and the advice I have received from them, especially when I first entered Parliament and needed it so greatly. All hon. members cannot help feeling appreciative of this service on first entering this Assembly. The same applies to the Refreshment Rooms staff and to others rendering service in this Assembly.

There is one matter I should like to make clear. Many thousands of electors have the idea that members of Parliament pay no income tax, and I take this opportunity of requesting the Press to devote a little of their spare space to making it plain to the public that members of Parliament pay the same taxes as ordinary members of the community. They enjoy no such privileges as special concessions for petrol or in any other way. Many people think that to members of Parliament all things are on the free list, but that is not so. The only privilege we enjoy is a railway pass. When we have served for three Parliaments or nine years we become entitled to our railway pass for life, and I do not propose to argue against this concession, except to say that it is not free. It is supplied by the Railway Department but paid for out of Consolidated Revenue, as the Estimates will show. This year the appropriation for these passes from Consolidated Revenue is £9,000.

I come now to the question of our conduct in Parliament. If my memory serves me correctly, I think it was the Premier who drew attention to the standard of conduct of hon. members in general, and suggested that it should be kept on a high plane. It is not good if hon. members do not keep their standard of conduct up to the highest level that is common in British parliamentary practice and procedure, and at one time the Premier suggested that he would appoint a committee comprising representatives from both sides of the House to draw up rules and conditions governing the conduct of hon. members and have them incorporated in the Standing Orders. As yet he has not done that, and I feel that if the conduct of this Assembly is allowed to continue as it has been on occasions in the past, the Committee suggested by the Premier is justified.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I think the hon. member is getting away from the matter before the Committee. His remarks are really a reflection on Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. LUCKINS:** I am not referring to Mr. Speaker's conduct of the House; I am referring to the cross-firing.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! All these matters are under the control of Mr. Speaker in the House or, in Committee, of whoever may be occupying the chair, and the hon. member's remarks are a reflection on the Chair.

**Mr. LUCKINS:** Then I will refer to the insults that have been hurled across the Chamber. It is time we conducted ourselves in such a way as to render service to the community and to set an example. In mentioning the conduct of certain hon. members of this Chamber I have no wish to reflect on the Chairman of Committees or Mr. Speaker; I am merely speaking of individual members. It behoves us to set a standard and I hope the Premier will go on with the proposal he made some years ago to have a committee of both sides of the Chamber appointed to discipline members generally. Such a committee would make for better debate. I have no desire to labour that point any further.

To my way of thinking our Librarian is the ideal type. He and his staff are well versed in library matters and one can at least get what one wants in the library. On one occasion that I can call to mind the Librarian was able to help me in finding an old English proverb, one that appealed to me because it portrayed the character of man. Whilst I do not want to detract from the Treasurer's knowledge of the poets and writers, the one I refer to runs something like this—

“He who once a good name gets  
May wet the bed and say he sweats.”

Whilst that proverb may not appeal to some members, it had a certain amount of appeal to me. Our Librarian can find any quotation or piece of poetry an hon. member may want so long as he gets an indication of what you are looking for. He has in the Library a very good source from which to draw upon. Whilst I am not given to much reading I sometimes feel that I should like something in the nature of a biography to read. In that respect I am well catered for in our Library. There are many books too of poems by Robert Burns, that great master of poetry, many passages from whose works are applicable to modern conditions. I am not gifted in that sphere nor do I desire to enter into a controversy on poetry or literature. I do say, however, that our Librarian and his staff render valuable services and I hope that they will in time be rewarded in the shape of further monetary consideration.

The nature of that part of this vote dealing with contingencies rather intrigues me. At one time, when Mr. Forgan Smith was Premier of this State, I went into this question and found that there was quite a ramification of payments under the heading of contingencies that could perhaps have been

applied to other headings. I have no occasion to question any of the items in the contingencies today.

**Mr. Nicklin:** In other words, you say that contingencies cover a multitude of sins.

**Mr. LUCKINS:** Perhaps we can put it that way, but I am not suggesting anything like that just now. The cost of printing “Hansard” has increased. I see no provision to cover the cost of air travel by members of Parliament, and I understand that those hon. members who live in distant parts of the State may now travel by air and at the same time retain their railway passes. Perhaps it is included in the amount of £2,500 for allowance to members; I do not know.

I see no provision in the contingencies to cover the increased cost that undoubtedly must be incurred in respect of the 13 new members to be returned to the next Parliament. They will need extra accommodation. Perhaps the Premier will be able to tell us all about it. I do not suppose it will be necessary to enlarge the Chamber to accommodate them, but they will need extra accommodation in the Lodge or in the parliamentary buildings because quite a number will come from the country.

There are no facilities in the building to enable elderly people or those not in good physical condition to go to the galleries to listen to the debates—they must climb two or three flights of stairs. Perhaps a lift could be installed for this purpose.

**Mr. Kerr:** What about an escalator?

**Mr. LUCKINS:** I do not know that the expense of one would be justified. The public should be considered in this respect although very few members of the public come to hear the debates. I do not know whether that is a reflection on hon. members or on the public generally. I am not in a position to say. Many facilities are required here for the reporting staff, the Press and those working on that floor of the building and I make the suggestion for the consideration of those concerned.

I desire to thank all members of the staff throughout the building for their good service and courtesy extended to me, in common with all other hon. members, on all occasions. I wish each well in his or her respective sphere and trust all will be suitably rewarded for the splendid service they have given to every hon. member.

**Mr. LOW (Cooroora) (2.24 p.m.):** I join with the other hon. members in expressing my appreciation of the services of the Clerk of the Parliament, the Chief Reporter, and all other members of the staff. I have had nothing but courteous attention from all of them and may I add that such courtesy is very helpful, especially to a new hon. member. Hon. members generally appreciate the kindly actions of the staff to hon. members, as they are considerably helped thereby in their work.



One of the most important factors in the consideration of this Vote is the acute lack of accommodation in the Parliamentary buildings. Even today, with 62 members, it is overcrowded. The accommodation provided for Opposition members is insufficient. When the 13 additional members are elected in May next the present congestion will be aggravated. It will be an impossible task for anyone to find sufficient room, not only in the Assembly itself but in the Lodge. When we recently discussed the appointment of an additional judge to the Supreme Court bench the Attorney-General said, "We will not make any appointment until we are able to make provision for the accommodation of the judge and his staff." The electors are about to elect 13 additional members to this House. What is the position here regarding accommodation for members? With the increase in the number of members there will be a consequential increase in staff, too. I draw the attention of Mr. Speaker and the Premier to the problem. It is so acute that the Parliamentary Buildings Committee has for months been endeavouring to find a separate room and telephone for me as Secretary of the Opposition. There is no room in this building for present members, let alone additional members.

**Mr. Power:** Alf. Muller is occupying your room.

**Mr. LOW:** That is a matter for the Parliamentary Buildings Committee to decide. Rooms are occupied by hon. members who have no right to occupy them. Several Government members are occupying rooms but are making no contribution to the funds of the Treasury.

**Mr. Farrell:** That is not true.

**Mr. LOW:** It is definitely true. These rooms are beautifully fitted up and provided with a telephone. It is rumoured that an increase in accommodation fees is about to be made. I want to tell you quite clearly that so far as I am concerned I will object to that increase until the present very unsatisfactory position is cleared up. Those occupying rooms without payment are virtually in the position of Parliamentary squatters. The Premier should personally look into the position. He should take stock of the whole building and see who occupies the various rooms, investigate the position of those who have no right to occupy them, and inquire what contribution they make towards the funds of the Treasury. I can vouch for the fact that rooms occupied by Opposition members are paid for.

I want to make some suggestion respecting the last increase in salaries of members of Parliament. The people look upon that increase as having been made with very bad grace. We decided that issue ourselves. We should do ourselves and everyone else a good turn if in future when an increase in Parliamentary salaries is mooted a judge is appointed as a tribunal to decide the issue. I am quite satisfied that if there was such an investigation there would be no reduction.

**Mr. Roberts:** You accepted your increase.

**Mr. LOW:** That is quite so. It was passed by this Chamber.

I am not saying that members are overpaid or underpaid. I should be quite prepared to allow a tribunal to decide the matter and if that system was adopted I am sure the people would look on parliamentarians and the whole system of government in a much better light than they do today, when they frequently say, "When are you going to put your salaries up again?" That is not a very nice state of affairs. I noticed that in the last increases members of the Cabinet came off best.

On looking through the list of salaries of officers of the Legislative Assembly, I notice that the appropriation for the Clerk of Parliament for 1948-49 was £1,044, the amount actually paid was £1,164, and the amount required for 1949-50 is £1,182. In view of the ability and the knowledge of the man occupying that position I think that is a pretty lousy salary. On every occasion when there is trouble in the House, when there is a difficult question to decide, whether by the Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, the Premier, or any other member, we always appeal to the Clerk of Parliament to put us on the right track. His ability should be recognised and he should receive an adequate salary.

There is another matter the Premier should interest himself in—the disqualification of State members seeking Federal honours. I feel that that disqualification should be removed and State members should be allowed to contest the Federal seats without first resigning.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member is not in order in discussing matters that involve legislation.

**Mr. LOW:** It should be the subject of representations by the Premier to the Federal Government. Hon. members know that we shall lose the member for West Moreton and the member for Dalby and I do not see any reason why a State member should not be allowed to contest a Federal election while retaining his State seat.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member is not in order.

**Mr. LOW:** The Premier should take up that matter with the Federal authorities with a view to the removal of that bar; and then the electors would not be without a representative for a period, as they will be in these cases.

As hon. members know, I was elected to the Printing Committee nearly three years ago but up to the present we have not had a meeting. I do not know the reason why. I mention the matter because I observe that the cost of printing has risen from £11,000 to £14,500. I think members of the Printing Committee especially should have some explanation of this substantial increase because that is a matter we are supposed to deal with.

Any other observations I wish to make I shall reserve till later in the discussion. In



conclusion, I should like once again to congratulate the staff on the kind and courteous manner in which they have carried out their duties. I can assure them it is appreciated by all hon. members.

**Hon. J. LARCOMBE** (Rockhampton—Treasurer) (2.34 p.m.): As a member who has been in this Parliament under the bicameral system and the unicameral system of government I should like to say a few words in appreciation of the unicameral system. It is the system of government that exists in Queensland alone of all the States of the Commonwealth. There are few parts of the world in which the single-chamber system of government obtains. It is based on sound, constitutional and parliamentary ethics and principles and conduces to the respect and support by the people of our parliamentary method of government. It is accepted today by the people of Queensland and by parliamentarians generally, but I well recollect the attacks made upon the Labour Government when they passed the legislation abolishing the Legislative Council.

**Mr. Wanstall:** That was because you did it against the expressed will of the people.

**Mr. LARCOMBE:** Nothing of the kind. I will explain in a few moments circumstances surrounding the abolition of the Legislative Council, but at present I would point out that we were accused at all times of violent and unlawful action in an attempt to discredit us, but we proceeded with our legislation.

**Mr. Brand:** You took a referendum.

**Mr. LARCOMBE:** There were three elections subsequently before we abolished the Legislative Council by legislation.

**Mr. Brand:** You took a referendum.

**Mr. LARCOMBE:** There were three subsequent triennial elections at which the people by their votes approved of the policy actions of the Government and therefore of that cardinal principle, the abolition of the Legislative Council.

**Mr. Brand:** You took a referendum.

**Mr. LARCOMBE:** I would point out that the Government not only had to pass this legislation through Parliament but afterwards had to face challenges at law and succeeded brilliantly in the vindication of their legislation on the abolition of the Legislative Council.

Hon. members, including the hon. member for Isis, this morning, spoke about the architectural beauty of the Legislative Council. No doubt it is a Chamber of architectural beauty but it was not a thing of constitutional beauty. The Council, when it existed, was contrary to all the established principles of democratic government and the proper control of the State. What was the position? The Legislative Assembly passed legislation and in due course, according to the Constitution, it went to the Legislative Council, but there it was sometimes destroyed and frequently mutilated. Why? Not because of any inherent defect or want of merit, but because the Legislative Council was composed of representatives of powerful

vested interests, monopolistic interests. These were really governing the State at the time—the government of the State was under monopolistic control. Many of the members of the Legislative Council were candidates who had been defeated at the elections, but had been foisted into the nominee Legislative Council and there given co-ordinate power as legislators with members of this Chamber, power to destroy legislation passed by the people's representatives. That was the farcical position that existed before the Legislative Council was abolished.

**Mr. Brand:** You appointed them.

**Mr. LARCOMBE:** They were appointed by the party of hon. members opposite. They appointed to the Legislative Council as co-ordinate legislators men who had been defeated by the electors at the State election. They stood for seats in the Legislative Assembly time and again but were defeated. They then were pitchforked into the Legislative Council with co-ordinate powers as legislators over those who had defeated them.

**Mr. Brand:** You adopted the Commo. technique when you sent them out.

**Mr. LARCOMBE:** No. We adopted the democratic technique, that of democracy, justice and fair play. The consequence was the people of the State endorsed our actions and the Council passed out of existence.

The Opposition claimed that the Legislative Council was an advisory body, but it made some of the greatest blunders ever committed by Parliament. Two glaring examples of that were the Industrial Arbitration Bill and the Workers' Compensation Bill. Shortly after the Labour Government came into power they passed a Workers' Compensation Bill, one of the provisions of which established a monopoly for workers' compensation insurance business in Queensland. The Legislative Council inserted certain amendments that appeared to destroy the principle of monopoly control. The Labour Government accepted those amendments and the opponents of Labour appealed to the courts, alleging that the Legislative Council had destroyed the principle of monopoly control, and the court ruled that this was not so, that the amendments inserted by the Legislative Council were valueless. Although the council they set out to destroy the principle of monopoly control they had really allowed it to be established.

The next great blunder of this alleged advisory Chamber was connected with the Industrial Arbitration Bill, which contained the principle of preference to unionists. The Legislative Council inserted certain amendments calculated to destroy the effect of the section that allowed the court to grant preference to unionists. The Labour Government again accepted the amendments and again the legislation was challenged by the opponents of Labour, and again the court upheld the Labour Government, ruling that the court had power to grant preference to unionists.

**Mr. Brand:** Despite that, the people said, "Hands off the Council."

**Mr. LARCOMBE:** The hon. member knows quite well that what I say is true, that the alleged advisory Chamber was not an advisory body at all, that it was there to represent vested interests and monopolies, to destroy legislation passed in the interests of the people.

**Mr. Brand:** Why did you take a referendum on it?

**Mr. LARCOMBE:** The reform instituted by the Labour Government has conduced to democracy and to economy, efficiency and expedition of government. All those valuable qualities of parliamentary government have been established by the unicameral system of government. It is a great reform, a democratic reform, one that I wish to emphasise. We can say in the words of Robert Burns, the Scottish poet—

And here's the grand fabric,  
the free constitution  
As built on the base,  
of our great revolution.

It was a great constitutional revolution. It was a remarkable piece of legislation. It was a reform that in my opinion has not been sufficiently emphasised in Queensland. It was a great democratic reform that provided freedom and democracy for the people of Queensland.

**Mr. Brand:** Nevertheless, the people were asked to vote for its abolition and they refused.

**Mr. LARCOMBE:** The hon. member knows quite well that the unicameral system of Government, for which the Labour Government were responsible, was a great reform that established liberty in this State. We hear a great deal about liberty leagues and freedom leagues, but the Legislative Council was a house of tyranny, a house of power, of monopoly and vested interests, all those powers that stand against democracy and freedom. Political tyranny and constitutional tyranny were exercised by the Legislative Council when it was in existence.

**Mr. Morris:** Do you apply that to the Senate in the Commonwealth sphere?

**Mr. LARCOMBE:** The Senate is elected on the popular franchise—one adult, one vote. I am not defending or condemning it at present, but I draw that very great distinction.

**Mr. Brand:** Do you support the principle of electing the Upper House?

**Mr. LARCOMBE:** I support the unicameral system of government such as we have in Queensland. We are discussing now not the Federal Constitution but the State Constitution. When time permits I am prepared to discuss the Commonwealth Constitution, the nature of the franchise, and other aspects of the methods of election in the Federal sphere. It is obvious, whatever may be said against the Senate, that it was established on a democratic franchise—one adult, one vote. It was not established by the appointment of defeated candidates, as was the Legislative Council in Queensland. The

fact remains that the Senate is elected on a democratic franchise and if hon. members opposite wish to destroy the Senate why do they not say so?

We know that right throughout history our Legislative Council, the House of Lords, and similar bodies have been the cause of great unrest and great disorder; and men like Winston Churchill, the Leader of the Conservative Party in England today, was one of the most powerful in the denunciation of the House of Lords and the way it operated when he was in control in England. He denounced the House of Lords in unmeasured terms and said that it was contrary to the principles of democracy and justice. When asked whether he ever knew where the House of Lords did wrong his reply was, "I want to know when they have ever been right; they have always been wrong." Those are the words of Churchill at that time; but, of course, since then he has become a crusted Conservative.

Parliament is an important institution and the history, the principles and the ideals of Parliament constitute a fascinating study. Time does not permit of further discussion at this juncture. One of the most powerful factors against Communism is a democratic Parliament; of that there is no doubt. We know very well that Communism thrives where there are monopolies, where there is injustice, where there is destitution, and where poverty thrives. When the people have not the opportunity through a democratically-controlled Parliament to express their ideas and their aspirations and have their grievances remedied, they will turn to Communism. That alone is a powerful argument in support of the unicameral system of Government. I have had experience of both forms of government and I realised the futility, the absurdity and the grotesqueness of the Legislative Council in the days when it still existed and before the unicameral system came into vogue. Many young members of Parliament have not had the opportunity of contrasting the two systems, as I have. The grotesqueness and the injustice of the old system were so great that I was delighted when the unicameral system came into operation. It has continued in operation without interruption. As the Secretary for Labour and Industry reminds me, the anti-Labour Party in 1929-32 dared not to re-establish the Legislative Council.

**Mr. Brand:** I saw the Legislative Council only after it had been stuffed by the Labour Government. Remember that.

**Mr. LARCOMBE:** Let me tell the hon. member for Isis that he did not see it stuffed by and with members of his own party, as I saw it. I know the history of the fight that was put up to bring about a democratic system of government, the unicameral system that we have today.

Those pioneers who fought for the Parliamentary system of government gave a great service to civilisation, to humanity, and to society. We know the great obstacles they had to face and the threats they were subjected to. Many of them even sacrificed their

lives in the cause of the Parliamentary institution of government. Throughout history these fine personalities and fine characters helped to make it possible for us to have the system we have today, a system under which government may be conducted without resort to force and violence.

Mention has been made of the methods of Parliament and of the Standing Orders. I recollect that Mr. Bruce Smith, a member of the Commonwealth Parliament, and a barrister of some note, recalled some remarkable instances in the history of parliamentary government. In the ancient days of the old direct democracy Parliament, which was held under the spreading tree the mover of an amendment came forward with a halter round his neck and if he did not get support for his amendment the rope was drawn taut. When speaking on this question some time ago I was asked whether I did not think it was a good reform to introduce at the present time and I replied that I had too much respect for the Leader of the Opposition, I could not support it. (Laughter.)

**Mr. MORRIS** (Enoggera) (3.52 p.m.): I join with other hon. members in expressing my appreciation of the services given to hon. members by the officers of the House. I desire to thank the Librarian and his assistants for the facilities and services available to hon. members in the Parliamentary Library. I have gone to the Library frequently in search of information and on no occasion have I come away without it.

I listened with great interest to the Treasurer in dealing with the one-chamber system of government in operation today. I think outside Canada this is the only place in the British Empire where such a system prevails. On many occasions I do not agree with the Treasurer but this is one on which I am with him—I think that the present system of a single chamber has very much to commend it. However, there is one fundamental essential in such a system, that is, that the Government should hold power with the approval of the majority of the people. That is absolutely fundamental and vitally necessary if we are to have a one-chamber system of government. I do not think that the present Government believe in that policy because their actions in this Chamber are a complete negation of that fundamental principle. Only recently the Government introduced a Bill to provide for the redistribution of the electoral districts of the State. I am quite prepared to admit that we did need a redistribution of seats but I do not believe in a redistribution that will allow a person in one area to have a vote equal to 2½ times the vote of the person in the metropolitan area.

**The CHAIRMAN:** That is a matter that does not come under this vote.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I am merely commenting on and enlarging upon the point made by the Treasurer. He told us he believes in the single-chamber system of government. I do, given certain fundamental principles that I believe in—to use the Treasurer's own words

—namely, one person, one vote; one vote, one value. The Treasurer got up and talked about the wonderful principle of one person, one vote; yet he is a member of a Government who have absolutely thrown that policy overboard and have introduced into Queensland a system that completely denies that fundamental principle of democracy. Not only have they thrown that principle overboard but they have done so purely to protect their own skins. Why cannot the Treasurer be honest? Why does the Treasurer tell us that he believes in the principle of one person, one vote, when he was a party to this iniquitous scheme of redistribution, which will allow us in this Assembly to have a government returned by only 37 per cent. of the votes? Thirty-seven per cent. of the votes at the forthcoming election can return the Labour Party to power in this Parliament, yet the Treasurer gets up here—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! That is a matter that comes under the Estimates of the Department of Justice.

**Mr. MORRIS:** It comes under the Vote "Legislative Assembly," too.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. Roberts:** If you had enough parties in the field you could have a Government in power representing only 20 per cent. of the votes.

**Mr. MORRIS:** That is so. In Europe only a little while ago a Government—the Socialist and Communist Government in Czechoslovakia—with 32 per cent. of the total votes, took power and threw out the democratic Government. That is what the hon. member for Nundah is pointing out. That can happen in Queensland, and it has actually happened elsewhere only recently. The Government in power in Queensland are self-avowed Socialists. What is likely to happen here? We shall not have an opportunity of getting up to discuss such a vote as the one we are now discussing, because there will be no Legislative Assembly. The party on the Treasury benches today is pledged to the establishment of a Supreme Economic Council. If it is allowed to put the policy to which it is pledged there will be no Legislative Assembly. This country will be ruled by people who are not even members of the Legislative Assembly.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I allowed the Treasurer a good deal of latitude and I have allowed the hon. member for Enoggera a good deal of latitude in reply, but I am not going to allow him to mistake liberty for licence. I shall have to keep every hon. member to the principles in the Vote before the Committee. I do not want to stifle discussion but I want the hon. member for Enoggera to keep within the limits of the vote.

**Mr. MORRIS:** Thank you, Mr. Mann, I will keep within the bounds of the debate one way or another.

Let me get back to the point I was making. This Parliament has been the bulwark against the pressure of powerful groups.

Century by century it has been the greatest upholder of democracy. The Government in power today are pledged to throw that democracy overboard. I will enlarge on that point as I go on.

As I said before, this Government in Queensland are pledged to Socialism and pledged to the Marxist doctrine of Socialism.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member is not in order in discussing that subject.

**Mr. MORRIS:** In that case, I will move an amendment.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member will not be in order even if he moves an amendment. We are discussing the Legislative Assembly Vote.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I move—

“That the vote ‘Legislative Assembly, £47,398,’ be reduced by £1.”

I do that as a censure of the Government, because I believe that this Government—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I should like to point out to the hon. member that although he has moved that amendment he can still discuss only the matters contained in the vote before the Committee.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I propose to do that. At the present time we spend £47,398 on the Legislative Assembly. If the Government who are in power are returned again, with the objective they have—the objective of Socialism—we shall not be able to spend anything on the Legislative Assembly.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member is not in order in discussing that matter. I have already pointed out to the hon. member that the moving of that amendment does not allow him to get away from the matter we are discussing—the Legislative Assembly.

**Mr. WANSTALL:** I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member not entitled to state his reason for moving the reduction of the vote?

**The CHAIRMAN:** We are dealing with an administrative vote of the Legislative Assembly. The hon. member can deal only with matters of administration.

**Mr. MORRIS:** In this vote I see that there is an allowance to members for postage and telegrams of £2,500, and also a travelling allowance to members of the Legislative Assembly amounting to £3,072. I oppose those items within this vote so long as we have a Government who are a Socialist Government. I now propose to examine whether this Government are a Socialist Government or not. I maintain that they are. I say further that if the people of Queensland were allowed to say whether they wanted a Socialist Government or not—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! That is a matter for the Estimates of the Department of Justice. The election of members of the

Legislative Assembly comes under the Estimates of the Department of Justice, not under this vote.

**Mr. Brand:** You allowed the Treasurer great latitude.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I did allow him a good deal of latitude. No-one took a point of order. Now the hon. member is going to take liberties with the latitude I have allowed him. I say now that if the hon. member does not deal strictly with the matter before the Committee I will ask him to resume his seat.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I did hope I should have the latitude of the Treasurer in traversing these points.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I have endeavoured to give the hon. member as much latitude as I could but he is taking advantage of my indulgence.

**Mr. MORRIS:** The point I intended to make is that we know the Government are Socialist and we know the people of Queensland do not want them—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the hon. member to resume his seat.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I move—

“That the Chairman’s ruling be disagreed to.”

**The CHAIRMAN:** I ask the hon. member to resume his seat.

Amendment (Mr. Morris) negatived.

**Mr. NICKLIN** (Murrumba—Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Mann—

**Mr. Hanlon:** The amendment is defeated.

**Mr. Wanstall:** Who is Chairman here, Mr. Mann, you or the Premier?

**Mr. NICKLIN:** I was on my feet and you, Mr. Mann, called for order.

**Mr. Hanlon:** You were waiting for me. (Opposition interjections.)

**Mr. NICKLIN:** Certainly I was but I was up before the motion was put. (Renewed interjections.)

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! If the hon. member for Enoggera does not obey my call to order I will name him for disobeying the authority of the Chair.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** Mr. Mann, has the motion been put or not?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The amendment has been defeated.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** I protest against the way in which you put the motion, Mr. Mann. I was standing on my feet and called before you put that motion.

Original question stated—

**Mr. NICKLIN** (Murrumba—Leader of the Opposition) (3.6 p.m.): If this is an example of what is going to happen in a so-called

deliberative Assembly the motion moved by the hon. member for Enoggera is more than justified.

**Mr. Hanlon:** It was not justified before.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. NICKLIN:** It is more than justified, in view of the fact the Chairman stopped me from speaking. I was on my feet and had the call. Apparently the Chairman must have been prompted by the Premier.

**Opposition Members:** Hear, hear!

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! It is not like the Leader of the Opposition——

**Mr. NICKLIN:** It is not like you to do it, Mr. Mann. (Opposition interjections.)

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! If the hon. gentleman would persuade the members sitting behind him to contain themselves very likely I should be able to hear what is going on. (Opposition interjections.)

**Mr. Brand:** It is hard to contain ourselves.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I warn the hon. member for Isis that if he continues to disregard the authority of the Chair I will name him. I am endeavouring to give all members a fair——

**Mr. Brand:** You are not.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I hope hon. members will allow me to control the debate. I do not want assistance from anyone. If I do, I will ask for that assistance. I now ask the hon. member for Isis to withdraw his reflection on the Chair.

**Mr. Brand:** What do you want me to withdraw?

**The CHAIRMAN:** That I am doing it in an unfair manner.

**Mr. Brand:** If you wish it I will withdraw but it is my opinion, nevertheless.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I ask the hon. member to withdraw the remark unreservedly.

**Mr. Brand:** No, I will not.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the hon. member to contain himself for a moment.

**Mr. Brand:** You contain yourself.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I am asking the hon. member to do something and I hope he will do it. Is the hon. member going to respect the authority of the Chair or defy it?

**Mr. Brand:** I do not intend to defy the Chair.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I am asking the hon. member to withdraw.

**Mr. Brand:** I will withdraw it, but I still think it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I am asking the hon. member to withdraw that remark unreservedly.

**Mr. Brand:** I will withdraw the remark. What is the remark you want withdrawn?

**The CHAIRMAN:** I am asking the hon. member to withdraw the remark about conducting the Committee in an unfair manner. Is the hon. member doing that?

**Mr. Brand:** I am withdrawing it.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** The vote before the Committee at the present time is that of the Legislative Assembly. I take it that it is the bounden duty of this Assembly to safeguard democracy and the freedom of the people, which at the present time are seriously endangered by the menace of Socialism and the actions of Socialism that we have seen displayed in this Chamber this afternoon. One of the principles of Socialism is to deny to its opponents the right of free speech and insofar as you this afternoon deny the Opposition the right to freely express their opinions on this matter——

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member is out of order. He must discuss the vote before the Committee.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** I am discussing the vote for this Assembly and, after all, the function of this Assembly is to ensure that there is a truly democratic institution in operation here. It is the system under which each section of the community is represented and those representatives have the right and privilege of expressing their opinion freely and without restriction within the Standing Orders of the House. But we find that is not being done. After all, what we saw happen here this afternoon is happening in other parts of the world.

**Mr. Brand:** In Russia, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** That is one of the reasons why I enter a most emphatic protest against anything that will tend in any way to hamper freedom of speech or the rights of the elected representatives of the people in this Assembly to express their opinions freely.

This afternoon the Treasurer gave us a long dissertation on the value of the unicameral system of government as against the bicameral system. He referred to the Legislative Council as being representative of vested interests and monopolies, as a House of tyranny, and said that it was abolished in consequence. He spoke of that as the technique of democracy. It was the technique of his brand of democracy, not of the democracy for which we British people stand. No doubt, taking it a little further, the technique of democracy to which the Treasurer and other hon. members on the Government side subscribe is the technique which denies their opponents any right of expressing their opinion at all.

**Mr. Morris:** Because they are Socialists.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** It is also the technique of the Socialists and the Socialist objective for which they stand.

Let me refer to the statement of a prominent member of the Labour Party on what Socialism means. He referred to Socialism and the parliamentary machinery of which we

are a part. I am referring to the statement by Mr. Scullin in the famous 1921 Labour Convention at Brisbane when Labour first adopted the socialisation policy for which it stands. He said—

“The first step was to employ the parliamentary machinery to nationalise industry to give the workers control of that industry. They would then have government by the workers in industry. The workers would become grouped and each group would elect representatives to the Supreme Economic Council which would take the place of political Parliament on questions of industry.”

Taking that statement in conjunction with the Treasurer's statement this afternoon, there is no doubt that it is the intention of hon. members on the Government side just to use this parliamentary machine as long as it suits them; then it will be abolished and in its place we shall find established the Supreme Economic Council, which is a plank of their policy. That justified the action of the hon. member for Enoggera this afternoon in moving for a reduction of this vote, as a use of parliamentary procedure to express our disapproval of the use of this parliamentary machine for which we are voting this afternoon some £47,000.

Parliament is the voice of the people and the people want their voice expressed in Parliament. I have often heard the Premier express the opinion that if you leave matters to the people they will do the right thing. The people will never vote to abolish Parliament and if they have the right to exercise a vote on the abolition of Parliament, they will not vote that way. It is the technique of the party opposite to deny them this right, and it will use the Parliamentary machine only while it suits it and then there will be a Supreme Economic Council and the only freedom in this community will be the freedom to do as we are told by the political bosses. That is what we are heading for and that is why hon. members opposite are so touchy on having a free discussion in this Parliament on this very important question of the place of the Parliamentary machine in a free British democracy.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I should like to point out to the Leader of the Opposition and hon. members on my left that this vote does not make provision for an academic discussion on democracy. We are dealing with the vote for the Legislative Assembly and there is no provision for an academic discussion at all.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** I have entered my protest against any attempt to limit the functions of this Parliament. I rose this afternoon because I felt that what occurred might be the fore-runner of something that would happen in the future when we should be denied the right of free speech. I have entered an emphatic protest and I repeat that if we do anything to wreck or alter the present parliamentary machine in our community it will be a sad day for Australia. It certainly will be a sad day for this State.

If anything needs to be preserved during the present troublous times it is our parliamentary institution. There is no doubt that hon. members opposite and the policy they have followed have as their objective the abolition of the parliamentary machine and the substitution of something that will take away from the people the rights they have in this parliamentary institution. Those rights are the only rights the people have at the present time—to give free expression to their opinion. Anything we might do to nullify Parliament will be a sad blow to democracy and is something against which everybody must enter an emphatic protest.

**Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca—Premier)** (3.18 p.m.): I can sympathise with the Leader of the Opposition. He was quite annoyed because he thought I was going to move the closure. Seeing that I was evidently going to move the closure, he sat still and after the Chairman put the question—

**Mr. Nicklin:** Before he put the question I was on my feet.

**Mr. HANLON:** I should have moved the closure because the hon. member for Enoggera was playing a sharp silly business man's trick in trying to defeat the decision of the Chair. That is important and I point out—

**Mr. MORRIS:** I rise to a point of order! I object to the words used by the Premier that I was using a sharp business man's trick. I ask for a withdrawal of the expression. I point out that all I was trying to do was to show the people what a Socialist he is. I ask the Premier to withdraw those words.

**Mr. HANLON:** The hon. member would not know a Socialist if he found one in his porridge.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I have asked that the statement be withdrawn.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I cannot see that there is anything offensive in the remark and in accordance with parliamentary procedure, there is nothing for the Premier to withdraw.

**Mr. MORRIS:** They are offensive to me, and I ask that they be withdrawn.

**Mr. HANLON:** It is very appropriate that today one hon. member should refer to the standard of debate. We heard the hon. member for Oxley complain that his language had deteriorated sadly because of his association with the party over there.

**Mr. KERR:** I rise to a point of order. The Premier knows perfectly well that the remarks I made applied to his own party, not to my party.

**Mr. HANLON:** The hon. member found it necessary to make use of the word “gutzer” although I did not actually hear him say it.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I rise to a point of order. I remind you, Mr. Mann, that you have not yet given a ruling on the point of order that I raised.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I ask the hon. member for Enoggera not to continue to interrupt. I ruled that the words were not offensive and there was nothing to withdraw.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I rise to a point of order. The words were offensive to me and I ask that they be withdrawn. I have a right to ask that—I have a right to ask that they be withdrawn. I ask that they be withdrawn.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The remarks of the Premier were an expression of an opinion by him. There was nothing offensive in the words. I have ruled that there was nothing to withdraw. I hope the hon. member will not continue his interruption because that will amount to a disregard of the authority of the Chair and it is highly disorderly to continue interruption.

**Mr. HANLON:** I was trying to explain before those interruptions took place that this is a vote for the services of the Legislative Assembly. It is not a vote for the creation of a Legislative Assembly or for the payment of salaries of parliamentarians, or the election of parliamentarians, or for the government of the country. The vote concerns the salary of the Clerk of Parliament. Does the hon. member want to reduce that salary? Then there is the amount required for the Clerk-Assistant. Does he want to reduce his salary? Then there are amounts required for the attendant and his staff, the Chief Reporter and his staff. Amounts are required for postage and incidentals, allowance to members, Refreshment Rooms, Library, buildings.

**Mr. Morris:** I made it perfectly clear.

**Mr. HANLON:** The hon. member made enough noise and has caused enough interruption already. I am entitled to have something to say now.

The vote deals with the amounts required for Library books, for the upkeep of buildings, the printing of "Hansard," travelling allowance to members, Empire Parliamentary Association contribution, and railway passes. Judging from his remarks I should say that he suggests we have not yet the intelligence to understand English, but he cannot get away with that. That is why I said that he resorted to a trick to try to defy the Chairman's ruling. I want to say right now that we have been given more latitude and greater width in debate in this Parliament in the past few years than ever we had in the history of Parliament, and we should give the utmost respect to the rulings of the Chairman and Mr. Speaker. We cannot continue to have this privilege if there is to be a complete disregard of the Chairman's ruling, with consequent offensive behaviour towards him and the Committee when his ruling does not suit certain people.

The Leader of the Opposition gave us a dissertation on Socialism and so did the hon. member for Enoggera but I do not think that there are two hon. members who are less qualified to speak on the subject of Socialism than they are. They have never given any study to the subject. If anyone can turn

over the pages of "Hansard" and show me evidence that they have given any study to the subject of the scientific planning of society to end exploitation of the people, I will eat the "Hansard." Not one word have they ever said and not one suggestion have they ever made for the purpose of putting an end to the exploitation of man by man. Neither is in any way interested in the sick, poor, aged or weary. It is an affront to anyone who knows anything at all about the theory of Socialism to hear an hon. member who is completely ignorant of the subject making political capital out of it and defying the Chairman. I am going to say right now that I am not going to join with the hon. member for Enoggera in weeping about the lost opportunities of the city people to exploit the country people—that is his moan on the redistribution. The Liberal Party is completely wrapped up in the desire of the usual city business clique to exploit the country people. They have the support of the Country Party because the Liberal Party controls the money and unfortunately the Country Party goes round as the Man Friday with the Liberal Party, which has the moneybags. (Opposition interjections.)

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. WANSTALL:** I rise to a point of order. Would you apply your ruling to the Premier?

**Mr. HANLON:** I asked the Chairman's permission to reply to the statement made by the hon. member for Enoggera, and I thank him for that opportunity.

The hon. member for Enoggera mentioned the need for more accommodation in Parliament House, and the frightful condition that is going to arise next year when the number of members of Parliament is increased. He does not seem to realise that until 1932 there were 72 members in the House, and that until 1922 there were 72 members in this Chamber and 59 in the adjoining one. They fitted in and got on quite well.

**Mr. Low:** A lot of members are occupying rooms they are not entitled to occupy.

**Mr. HANLON:** The House is quite sufficiently commodious to provide accommodation for 131 members, and we must remember that any additional staff also was installed in it at the time. It has been the desire of members of Parliament to have individual offices where they may do the business of their electorates. That is very laudable and desirable. I hope that when building restrictions are removed and the people find it easier to get roofs over their heads it will be possible to give attention to accommodation for individual members of Parliament. In the last few decades the work of Parliament has altered considerably. Members have come in closer contact with their constituents. More clerical assistance has been provided for them in consequence.

**Mr. Hiley:** Would that not negative the value of that illustration you gave previously of 72 members?

**Mr. HANLON:** No, I do not think it does. The desire to provide better accommodation in the future does not imperil the House from carrying on with 72 members.

**Mr. Hiley:** You said much more work is being done by members of Parliament and there is need for more typists and that kind of thing.

**Mr. HANLON:** That is so. We do need more room, but with 72 members coming in the accommodation will not be taxed to the extent it previously was when there were 131 members. It will not hurt us, until there is a roof over the heads of every family, to carry on with 75 members with our present accommodation.

**Mr. Low** interjected.

**Mr. HANLON:** If any hon. member has any complaint to make he can make it to the Parliamentary Buildings Committee.

**Mr. Low:** That committee cannot solve the problem.

**Mr. HANLON:** The hon. member is a member of that committee. I heard hon. members opposite this afternoon compliment Mr. Speaker on the way he has looked after the interests of members.

The hon. member for Cooroora also complained of the printing of "Hansard." He said that the Printing Committee had not been called together to deal with the printing of "Hansard." The Printing Committee never has dealt with the printing of "Hansard."

**Mr. Low:** "Hansard" and other matters.

**Mr. HANLON:** "Hansard" is not dealt with by the printing committee. It is called together to deal with the printing of papers the printing of which is not authorised by Act of Parliament. That is the only printing matter the committee has to deal with. If the hon. member looked at the Estimates he would see what the position was last year. Some years ago, on the suggestion of hon. members, we published the Estimates in three columns instead of two so that members would know what had been spent in the last year. If they looked up that vote they will find that last year it was £11,000 and the amount spent was £14,500. Costs went up and had to be met.

**Mr. Low:** That would not come under the Printing Committee.

**Mr. HANLON:** No, any more than it would come under the Air Raid Wardens or the South Polar Expedition. It had nothing to do with it. That is what I am trying to impress on the hon. member. I am endeavouring to enlighten him about something, but if he digs his toes in and says, "I will not understand," there is nothing I can do to help him. The Printing Committee does not set itself up as a super Parliament to say whether parliamentary papers are to be printed; they are printed by Parliament's orders; anything Parliament does not order to be printed is dealt with by the Printing Committee. We are not

estimating for a great increase this year; we are allocating what it cost last year; if there is any other increase we shall have to meet it out of unforeseen expenditure.

I wanted to say, before the hon. member got a bit annoyed over there this afternoon, that I was appreciative of the complimentary remarks made by most hon. members about the staff of the House. The Library, to my mind, is a very excellent library indeed. I do not know of any other library in the Commonwealth that members can use to advantage in any way in which they cannot use this one. I do not think anything is often asked from the Librarian by members that he is unable to supply. I want to point out also that the Librarian is not merely an assistant with an index. To be a success our present Librarian has to be a man of wide general knowledge. He has to be able to guide a member when he asks him for any information on a particular subject, and to be able to pick out the works on a particular subject for him. Also, if he is a man of wide knowledge and knows his members, he can usually estimate the direction in which the hon. member who is asking the question is widening his knowledge, knowing what political party he belongs to and so on. A good librarian is an immense help to members in that way. The present Librarian has done an excellent job.

For a long period we had a very remarkable man as Librarian, a man named John Murray, who started work here as a message boy at about 14 years of age and later became Librarian. I do not think in the whole of the Commonwealth there was a man who could give you as promptly a volume or publication or return or report as John Murray could. The whole index was in his head. He knew just where everything was.

John Murray was a man of tremendously wide knowledge. He was a great reader. One would ask him for some book or other and probably he would reach for it under a table or behind a box and bring it out. Old members of this Parliament will tell you that John Murray was the most amazing man they ever met. I do not think there was a subject that ever interested members of Parliament on which John Murray could not give a bit of guidance. Unfortunately, at his death his index and knowledge died with him. The man who succeeded him took over an immense collection of books that had never been properly indexed or recorded. Consequently, the task before the present Librarian is indeed a very heavy one but he is facing up to it well and getting the Library into shape. Men like the late John Murray are freaks who come once in a while; one cannot pick up some similar freak to replace them. After all, the only sound way to conduct a library is to have everything indexed and cross-indexed, not only things but subject matter.

I do not agree with the hon. member for Hamilton that members should be climbing up to the shelves and helping themselves to the books. I do not see how order could possibly be kept if the attendants did not



hand out the books to those who want them. I can imagine the mess the Library would be in if 62 members, and shortly 75 members, went in there and at their own sweet will hopped onto the shelves and took out any books they wanted and when they had finished with them left them on the seats in this Chamber or in the rooms they occupied.

**Mr. H. B. Taylor:** I wanted members to be more dependent on themselves and not always having the Librarian to seek out books for them.

**Mr. HANLON:** I think the hon. member will realise that it is essential that the Librarian should know where everything is when it is wanted. It is very important that he should know the person who got the book before the hon. member who wants it. That is very important, especially at a time when there is a debate on a certain subject and a number of members want the same volume. It is particularly important that the books in the Library should be kept under strict control.

**Mr. H. B. Taylor:** You are misinterpreting my remarks.

**Mr. HANLON:** The Library staff are doing a splendid job and when they get the indexing and cross-indexing done we shall have a service second to none in the Commonwealth.

As regards "Hansard"; as long as I have been in this House it has always been a wonder to me how they get the debates. For instance, take the interlude that took place here a quarter of an hour or so ago. It is amazing to me how they manage to sort out the remarks—members on both sides of the Chamber calling out at once—and get the sense of what the member who has the floor is saying. We owe a great deal of appreciation to them for the pains they take to try to get our statements correctly.

Mention has been made of the loss on the Parliamentary refreshment rooms but refreshment rooms generally are a losing undertaking. If the Refreshment Rooms are to be kept to meet the needs of members it means that the staff must be kept on when at times their services are not so necessary as at other times. It is impossible to run a refreshment room with fluctuating attendances, as happens in the Parliamentary dining-room, and run them in any way as economically as an institution that is being run only for profit.

Some hon. members mentioned the possibility of broadcasting. Broadcasting of parliamentary proceedings would make an appeal only to listeners in the evening and this Parliament does not sit in the evening or only very rarely and then when it is sitting on the Estimates. For only about eight nights in a session do we sit on Estimates and then perhaps two or three nights we discuss Bills.

**Mr. Low:** Question time in the Federal Parliament is always interesting to listen to.

**Mr. HANLON:** Questions are recorded and then put over the air at night. No

broadcasting station would broadcast debates of this Parliament in the day-time. They would not be attractive enough for listeners. They would select the matter to be broadcast and not record and then broadcast the whole of the day's debate in this Parliament. That would be impossible. We should have the Leader of the Opposition saying it was not democratic if my speech was broadcast and not his. We should be in all sorts of holts there if he did not get his little bit of wire instead of mine. We made inquiries about broadcasting a couple of years ago but no private station is greatly interested in broadcasting debates in the day-time.

Then, our questions would have to be altered if they were going to be broadcast. We should have to have the question read out by the member asking it and the answer read by the Minister making the reply. At present our method of asking questions is merely for an hon. member to say, "I desire to ask Question No. so-and-so standing to my name." That would convey nothing to anyone listening outside, just as it conveys nothing to anyone sitting in the gallery now.

The messengers in this House have been mentioned today. The typist staff and messengers all play their part in the work of the House. The Clerk of Parliament and his assistants all give very good service to the House and I think hon. members generally are entitled to say, "Thank you all for the way you have looked after us during the year."

**Mr. HILEY:** (Logan) (3.43 p.m.): I should be glad if the Premier would give us an indication, in reply to the point made by the hon. member for Oxley, concerning the advantage of furnishing hon. members with sets of statutes annotated up to date with the amendments.

**Mr. Hanlon:** For your information, I made inquiries and I find that when those sets were issued we did not have a separate Liberal Party, but I will endeavour to get a set for you.

**Mr. HILEY:** I thank the Premier. At the moment, for the convenience of the House when it is sitting there are two sets of statutes in the Chamber. They are 1936 sets and there is no annotation of them with the amendments up to date. It was a practice regularly carried out in the olden days for either the Crown law officers or some impecunious barristers—

**Mr. Hanlon:** There are no impecunious barristers these days.

**Mr. HILEY:** It is a question of finding someone who is qualified to do it. The point is that we should not be asked to consider legislation that comes before this House, with 1936 statutes, and then have to search through every year after that to determine what is the law. The pace that is set by this House in Committee is too rapid for us to hope to keep pace with each question if one has to try to discover 10 years of law in one step. Whilst it may cost a sum of money, I suggest that it is essential that the working

sets of statutes in this House should be annotated with the amendments up to date and I hope the Premier will not only do what he has indicated he will do for our particular room, which is now back to the 1911 vintage, but will bring the statutes right through the House up to date.

Vote (Legislative Assembly) agreed to.

PREMIER AND CHIEF SECRETARY.  
CHIEF OFFICE.

**Hon. E. M. HANLON** (Ithaca—Premier)  
(3.44 p.m.): I move—

“That £28,227 be granted for ‘Premier and Chief Secretary—Chief Office.’”

There is a decrease in this Vote. Salaries have increased by £1,231, but contingencies are down by £1,660.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I desire to inform hon. members that I propose to follow the practice of allowing full discussion on the Chief Office Vote of each department so far as Consolidated Revenue is concerned, and then confine the discussion to each particular vote.

For the information of hon. members, I point out that the administrative acts of a department are open to debate, but the necessity for legislation and matters involving legislation cannot be discussed in Committee of Supply.

**Mr. HILEY** (Logan) (3.45 p.m.): There are two aspects of the work of the Premier's Department and his officers about which I should like to say a word or two. In the first place I refer to the work of the department in the attraction of new industries, work in which the Premier and his office, and the Agent-General in London, play parts. The second aspect relates to the work of the Loan Council, the Loan Council the Premier of the State, with officers of his department, frequently attends and where the basic policies of the State, so important in many aspects, transcending mere financial considerations, are dealt with and decided.

On those aspects I raise two points. They relate somewhat to the matter the hon. member for Enoggera was discussing half an hour ago and the particular application I give is this: we know—and I personally honour him for his efforts in this direction—that the Premier has set out to seek new industries for Queensland, many from overseas. Where the people of this State are beginning to experience real difficulties in connection with those efforts and where the people overseas must in turn do so, if they have not already experienced difficulty, is to reconcile the attempts of the officers of the department and the Premier to attract new industries to this State with the Government's simultaneously deciding, through their party, that they are quite openly pledged to Socialism, pledged to put an end eventually to the private ownership of the businesses the Premier is seeking to attract. I think in the interests of the good name of this State and its Government this is a matter that admits of no

deception at all. If the Government are honest in their decision in relation to Socialism, the proper thing is to proclaim to the world that it is their intention to put the industries they are seeking to attract under notice that this State Government are confessedly socialistic and that these people enter Queensland at their own risk. If the administrative practice of the department is to continue to attract these industries without telling the people concerned that very important fact, at its very best it savours of a bad form of deception, and at its worst it would attract worse comment. So much for the aspect of attracting new industries to the State.

Coming now to the operations of the Loan Council, we find that the citizens of Australia are being asked with every passing day to contribute to what are described in patriotic terms as security loans. The citizens of Australia are asked to save money to pass on to the Government, partly for the security of their old age and partly because of the patriotic argument that it will be of assistance to the State that this Premier represents on the Loan Council. Again I say the confessedly socialistic pledges of the Government party place a doubt upon the whole propriety of the Government's asking the people to part with their savings in the name of security if in fact the Government are pledged to implement a policy of Socialism. That again raises a question of deception and unless the people are plainly told that the Government of this State and those of several of the States that are seeking loans in the name of patriotism are also Governments pledged to implement Socialism as soon as they can, it makes a hollow farce of the suggestion of loans for security of personal ownership of property.

I raise those two issues because I think we have to make up our minds one way or the other. Are we to tell the people—

**Mr. Roberts:** The people would not have subscribed to Commonwealth loans so confidently as they have if they thought that.

**Mr. HILEY:** That gives added weight to the point I make. The people have not been told in such plain terms that the Queensland Government, who are part of the Loan Council, are determinedly and confessedly a socialistic Government. They have never been told that. No prominence has been given to the decision of the Government Party as to whether they pin their faith to some diluted form of Socialism or some advanced form of Socialism.

I have raised two important questions that fall squarely within the responsibility of the Premier's department.

**Hon. E. M. HANLON** (Ithaca—Premier) (3.51 p.m.): I do not think the hon. member for Logan will get much support for that little diatribe. Any new industry that we are seeking to attract to Australia from Great Britain is, according to the hon. member, already ruined. According to him, industry in Great Britain is ruined because of the

Socialist Government there—industry is condemned in that country. Where is it to go? According to him, it is damned if it comes to Australia because, again according to him, Australia has a Socialist Government. If it goes to New Zealand it will be damned there too, or if it goes anywhere else. Where is it to go? Where does the hon. member suggest that the capital should fly in order to get security?

**Mr. Morris** interjected.

**Mr. HANLON:** The hon. member should not interrupt his betters and if he does not perhaps he will learn something. Nothing is indicated more clearly on this earth than the fact that the hon. member for Enoggera has not given one thought to the problem. He has never considered the importance of introducing industries into Australia from Great Britain. According to the hon. member for Logan, they will be damned when they get here, because the Government here are a Socialist Government. The hon. member and members of his party have continually said that they are ruined in Great Britain because the Government there are Socialist. According to them, wherever the British investor goes he is ruined. He is ruined at home and he is ruined if he leaves home. I do not think their statements will make much difference anywhere because they amount only to political propaganda.

The hon. member for Logan has shown no real interests in the development of this country. Every statement he has made in this connection has had a bad effect on this country, because according to him the country will be ruined by the introduction of these new industries. Such statements, if continued, may lead to the ruination of the country in the long run, because they tend to show that such industries will be destroyed by the Labour Party. His object is to bring about distrust of the Labour Party in the minds of the people generally.

The hon. member for Enoggera should have a broader outlook than that too. I do not suppose that I can expect much from him in that direction. A few weeks ago we had a long debate on this subject initiated by hon. members opposite although there was nothing before the House to justify such a debate. They charged the Government of Queensland with having sold out the coal industry of this State to a lot of go-getters from overseas, and they urged the cancellation of an agreement with a British company. That agreement was entered into for the purpose of developing the coal industry of Queensland. It was an agreement made with the Queensland Parliament. Every word that they uttered pointed to the fact that if ever they should become the Government the people concerned in the agreement would not get a fair deal from them. Just imagine the thoughts of people who listened to that debate! These people came from overseas and we could not expect them to know, as we know, that there is little possibility of hon. members opposite getting control of the Government benches. The people in England are in the habit of regarding an Opposition as a potential alternative Government. Every

word that hon. members opposite uttered during that debate could only be taken to mean that if they were returned to power the company concerned would not get a fair deal and that the Opposition regarded them as a lot of grafters, spielers, and swindlers who were coming here to rob this country. What impression could they take from it? I say definitely that to a much lesser extent the statement made by the hon. member for Logan today is in the same category and is calculated to capture votes even though it may ruin the industry of the country. What does the welfare or prosperity of the people matter if they can catch a vote?

**Mr. Hiley:** You are only attempting to deceive them.

**Mr. HANLON:** I am not going to believe that the people are going to be caught by such cheap and false propaganda.

The hon. member for Logan mentioned the Loan Council. It is a constitutional authority. The Premier of each State is a member of the Loan Council. That body was created in 1927 when the Commonwealth and various State Governments found they were competing with one another in the money markets of Australia and Britain. Each was trying to outbid the other to get money. Lenders, knowing there was competition between the States, would go slow on advances so that they could extract higher interest. The gentleman who was Premier of this State, the Hon. W. Forgan Smith, was one of the men who took part in the planning of the Loan Council, which has prevented such competition ever since. The Loan Council consists of six State Premiers, the Prime Minister, and the Federal Treasurer. The Federal Government have two of the eight votes on the Loan Council. Money borrowed by the Commonwealth or State Governments for any other purpose than defence, must be approved by that authority. I well remember that in the years when Tory Governments were in power in the Federal Parliament, such as the Lyons and Bruce-Page Governments, they would come along and say that the banks would agree to make only a certain amount of money available to the Loan Council for the services of the Commonwealth. Consequently both Federal and State Governments had to fit their works programme and the services of the people to the decision of the banks. Actually the bankers were governing the country, not the Federal Parliament or the State Governments.

That has all gone by the board. With the departure of anti-Labour Governments have come a Government who make the financial institutions meet the requirements of the Governments in the service of the people.

In order to try to prevent extravagance, certain precautions are taken. There is a danger of making money available to Governments too readily. Hon. members will appreciate that. It is quite possible for Governments to over-spend. The Loan Council wisely took the precaution to have all works submitted to the officials of the Federal Government. A Commonwealth Co-ordinator-General of Public Works was

appointed by the Federal Government, who examined all works submitted from time to time by each of the State Governments as well as the various Commonwealth departments. The State itself has its programme of works prepared. It then is submitted to its own Co-ordinator-General of Public Works, who goes through them. He states what should be approved and what should be refused. Finally, the Federal authorities go over the approved works again and upon the decision of the Commonwealth Co-ordinator-General of Public Works depends exactly how the various State Governments get on. The Loan Council then decides what money should be made available to meet the requirements of the Government.

What a complete change from the days when the people governing the Commonwealth were anti-Socialists! They wanted only sweated labour; they wanted the hungry looking for jobs; they wanted the workers tired and suffering, and they wanted them to be hanging around looking for jobs. There has been a tremendous change since the Labour Party has had charge of the government of the country, and have set about to finance public works properly.

Another body is set up to deal with the national works programme. It is a separate body again. It consists of the six State Premiers and two representatives of the Federal Government, usually the Prime Minister and one of the Ministers. That council's job is to provide for work ahead—not work of immediate necessity, but long-term jobs that can be put into operation immediately labour becomes plentiful. The main job of the National Works Council is to see that this country will never again be caught in the condition it was in in the '30s when, through the greed of the financial institutions in this country, something like 100,000 were thrown out of work and on to the dole. Works costing something between £600,000,000 and £700,000,000 have been planned in detail for many years ahead if anything should happen to bring about any overseas disturbance or collapse. We have been warned about what will happen if there is a financial collapse in the United States. If such a thing should happen and there was large unemployment, work would be immediately started in this country that would take up the slack. That is part of the plan to guarantee national employment. Without the National Works Council full employment could not be guaranteed. Hon. members should realise the importance of that body. Imagine the position we should be in tomorrow if we, without the power to collect income tax or unemployment relief tax, found ourselves saddled, as we were in 1932 when we took over from the Country Party, with something like 30,000 unemployed to feed. We just could not do it.

**Mr. Sparkes:** There were 28,000 unemployed when the Country Party took over.

**Mr. HANLON:** No. Everybody who was unemployed in 1929 when the Country Party took over was being paid unemployment insurance. There was money in the Treasury

to provide for him, but when the Country Party came in it said, "Here is a chance to get cheap labour and bring wages down," and it lent our money to Victoria. The balance it wasted in deficits and started to make the country prosperous by chopping down workers' wages and making them miserable. That is the contrast between then and today, when you have a Federal Government who are able to control the finances of the country. By jove, that is what is making them squeal—the control of the finances! We are not going to have any position arise again where thousands of people will be walking the streets, not only losing wages but being deprived of the wages necessary to give them a decent standard and being deprived of their pride and confidence through having to solicit the dole. Much more psychological damage was done to the people of this country in those years than financial damage. But those two institutions—the Loan Council and the National Works Council—many people confuse them; they are two distinct bodies each with distinct activities, although the membership is much the same—are a great safeguard. While we have the single tax authority it is essential that the Premiers' Conference should remain a separate body to deal with the allocation of taxation. When a Premier goes to a Federal conference he goes in three capacities. He is a member of the Premiers' Conference, which has the job of allocating tax revenue; he is a member of the Loan Council, which provides for current public works year by year; and he is a member of the National Works Council, which keeps up a large reservoir of works, and plans ahead for many years to meet any possible decline in employment. Those are very important things and I am happy about the way they have been carried out so far.

**Mr. NICKLIN** (Murrumbidgee—Leader of the Opposition) (4.5 p.m.): The department controlled by the Premier contains many sub-departments of particular importance to the State.

I wish to refer some of the remarks of the Premier in regard to the planning of a works programme to take up the slack if ever it should be necessary in the future. In reply to the hon. gentleman I emphasise that the National Works Council and the States' subsidiary authorities, such as the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works, have plans to carry out work that will take up this slack. How far have these plans progressed? It is not a bit of use having plans to do things if the work cannot be done. For example, we find that Mr. Lang, the chief irrigation officer in this State, a very capable man who was brought here to do big jobs in irrigation—and irrigation is one of the most important projects to be carried out—is leaving the State service. He is disappointed because he was unable to do anything in regard to the work that he was brought here to do—carry out irrigation projects throughout the State. What is the good of our having plans if they cannot be put into effect? Plans will not develop this country. A technical staff is necessary to back up the plans. The sub-departments of

the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works are particularly weak on technical men. The head of this department, Mr. Kemp, whom I should term No. 1 Public Servant in Queensland—

**Mr. Hanlon:** In the Commonwealth, I should say.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** Yes, I go as far as the Premier. This State owes a great debt of gratitude to Mr. Kemp for all he has done for this State but by overworking him it is hastening him to an early grave. He is overworked because of the simple fact that he is not backed by the technical staff to enable him to carry the many responsibilities he has had to bear through the years. Looking at the organisation of his department, we find that, apart from the technical staff employed by the Stanley River Works Board and the Bridge Board, there is only one engineer and one hydrologist. That is the technical staff that this very important department has at its disposal to plan the works we hear so much about, to plan the works mentioned in the election Budget.

It is no use talking about plans for this and for that if there is not the technical staff to put those plans into effect. There is a big shortage of technical men in Queensland but when we do get a good man we go and lose him because he is not given the technical men to enable him to put his work into operation. That must be looked into. It is not a bit of use standing up in this Chamber saying that this and that are going to be done to make Queensland the greatest State in the Commonwealth if we do not put the plans into effect. And we cannot do this at the moment because we have not the technical staff. We are losing the technical men we have got because they are not paid sufficient in salaries to keep them here. That is the position facing Queensland. If it ever became necessary to put these big plans into effect, to pick up the slack in the recession, we should never be able to do it, unless our ways are altered.

The Premier endeavoured to accuse the Opposition of chasing from Queensland people who were prepared to establish industries here. We of the Opposition are just as keen as is the Premier to attract industries to the State. I commend the Premier for the efforts he has made to get industries to come here but I defy him to give one instance where we on this side have ever hampered him.

The hon. gentleman used as an excuse the action the Opposition took in connection with the Blair Athol agreement. Were we not justified in taking that action? We as a Parliament had ratified an agreement with a company to work that great national asset of ours.

**Mr. Hanlon:** You said they were a lot of grafters and sharps.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** I challenge the Premier to substantiate that statement in any way. We did nothing of the sort. We were very concerned, as was everybody else in the State, about the fact that nothing was being done and no information was being given about the activity or lack of activity by the company that was going to work Blair Athol.

That action was justified because we as a Parliament in the first place ratified that agreement, and when no action was taken to work that field, were we not justified in asking that the clauses of the agreement be put into effect? Of course we were. The reason why the motion was moved was that no real effort was being made by the company to carry out its part of the contract. To say that the reason the company failed to carry out its obligation was the motion moved in this Parliament is all just so much bunk, just an endeavour to cover up the misgivings the Premier himself had about it.

Within a few hours after the moving of that motion the representative of the company met the Premier and gave him its decision on the matter. The reason it gave was that the deposit of coal was too far from the seaboard and the company could not see the necessary markets. Can the Opposition be blamed for putting Blair Athol out there or because the company could not see the necessary markets?

**Mr. Hiley:** That decision had been reached before the debate took place.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** It was reached before the representative of that company left England, and that was a long time before that motion was moved in this Parliament. If the company had conveyed that decision to Parliament through the Premier before the motion was moved, it would never have been moved. The only reason for moving it was to ascertain whether the obligations entered into by the other party to the contract were being carried out or not. No information was furnished to this Parliament and we had every right to move the motion in order to ascertain the position.

It is no use the Premier's coming here and endeavouring to put all the blame on the Opposition for the failure of that Blair Athol proposal. He knows quite well why the company did not go on with it. He was just as worried about it as we were. We can quite appreciate how he felt about it because, as a Queenslander, he thought it would have been something big for Queensland and we on this side have just as big a regard for the need for doing something there as the Premier has. We regret with him that the company was not able to go on with the agreement.

**Mr. Hanlon:** What did you want to cancel it for if you regretted that they could not go on with it?

**Mr. NICKLIN:** When two people enter into an agreement and one does not carry it out, the usual thing to do is cancel it. That was the position that faced us here. Was the other party to the agreement prepared to go on with the job? We were entitled to know that, seeing that it involved an asset of this State. That information should have been given to this Parliament; Parliament was entitled to ask for it. There was such a long delay, and such complete silence. There was no evidence of activity and the company did not show evidence that it was prepared

to go on with the scheme. There was no sign of activity; there was no sign that the other party was going to carry out its part of the contract and therefore we had the right to demand to know what exactly was going on. And that is what we did. It was the sole purpose of the motion. It is no use the Premier's endeavouring to camouflage the failure of the deal by blaming the Opposition for it.

I repeat that it is not a bit of use talking about having plans and going back into the Dark Ages and saying that the Moore Government did this and they did that. What we want to know is: is this State adequately equipped in all technical departments with the necessary staff to put into effect the plans we see on paper? Plans on paper are no good unless they are backed by blue-prints and the technical staff to put them into effect and make them realities instead of paper dreams. Far too many of the projects this State is supposed to carry out are paper dreams—something produced for the edification of the electors. No attempt by real sound plans and blue-prints backed with the staff and materials required have been put before us. Plans alone will not stop a recession. All the Government have put before us might be termed paper dreams.

**Mr. FARRELL** (Maryborough) (4.18 p.m.): Despite the criticism of the Opposition on this vote, the people generally have agreed that during the time we have been in charge of the government of this country the policy we have operated in investigating every project for the development of this State was sound. We have had the satisfaction of knowing that our projects have been based on sure foundations. It seems to be the policy of the Opposition to criticise that defined policy, which has been in existence for a long time. It will be found on analysis that we have not made many mistakes in putting into operation some of the plans we have made for the development of this State, whereas if we turn back the pages of history we find that during the time the Opposition were the Government many mistakes were made costing the country millions of pounds. We found on assuming office that we had to get down to a method of proper planning not only for the works envisaged by the Government but those of local authorities. And so we laid down a policy that if we were to continue the proper development of this State we had to have orderly planning, just the same as we have orderly marketing for the products of this country.

It should not be necessary, for example, to remind hon. members opposite of the extensive investigations that were carried out with a view to the development of electricity throughout the State. If hon. members opposite had had the vision in their days of Government that we fortunately possess, we should now be in a position to meet all the demands of secondary industry in this respect. However, the Labour Government have been able to develop electricity undertakings along sound lines. An Act was passed providing for the establishment of regional electricity

boards and in the next two or three years we shall be in a position to meet any demand that industry makes for electric energy. Therefore, it will be seen that our early investigations now stand us in good stead—we have built on sure foundations. It is the policy of the Government to encourage the establishment of new secondary industries and to induce investors to come from overseas and in the course of time we shall be in a position to meet their whole requirements.

Let me refer hon. members opposite to the investigations that were carried out in connection with the Burdekin River bridge, investigations that took the long view. We had to take into account the potential traffic development on our North Coast Railway and with that object in view engineers were sent overseas to get the requisite knowledge to enable them to cope with increasing traffic and to obviate flood dangers. Today those plans are being carried out and in the course of time the bridge will be built and the demands on our North Coast Railway will be satisfied. Is that a right procedure or not? I am sure that the people generally will approve of our action. We have always planned ahead, we have not been content to rest on the blueprint stage—the plans are now being carried out.

We also made an extensive investigation into the beef cattle industry, an industry that means so much to the economic life of this State. In the course of those investigations consideration was given to the establishment of public abattoirs in the various parts of the State. Is it not a fact that we are now about to launch upon the establishment of abattoirs throughout Queensland? Is that not in keeping with the progress and development of the State generally? The State is advancing and the Government are planning to give effect to the development from year to year. These public utilities are being established in the interests of the people and with the object of meeting progressive development from time to time.

Have we not been trounced by the Opposition in relation to some of our schemes, particularly the Queensland-British Food Corporation scheme at Peak Downs, which is only another of the matters that have come to my mind in speaking of the investigations made by this department? We have investigated the possibilities of water conservation by harnessing the Burdekin River. These investigations have extended over four years. If we are able to convince the Commonwealth of the stability and economic value of this scheme and get its help to carry out this immense project, it will open up for settlement an enormous tract of land, upon which 5,000 farmers can be placed. Is that a blueprint or an achievement?

**Mr. Wanstall:** It is a blue-print.

**Mr. FARRELL:** It is beyond the blueprint stage. I believe that in a very short time the Premier will be able to announce that this project has been approved by the Commonwealth Government and that they are prepared to back it to the extent of £15,000,000. Is that not an achievement?

Then we have the Barron and Walsh Rivers project, which will open up immense possibilities for the settlement of our far northern lands. It is all very well for the Opposition to complain that all these schemes are only in the blue-print stage, but they must admit that the Government have done their utmost to proceed with the development of the State along economic lines. We have a right to say what has been accomplished and what will be accomplished in the next 15 or 20 years to make the State one of the most progressive in the Commonwealth.

**Mr. Heading:** You should go down and have a look at some of the other States.

**Mr. FARRELL:** It is desirable that we should first go through our own State to see what the Government have accomplished. If the hon. member has the time he should take a trip North and he will see for himself what is envisaged in the Government's programme of works. The hon. member knows, too, as he is associated with several dairy companies, that there never was a time in the history of the State when his members have been more prosperous. That is a result of the progressive policy of the Government and their planned works programme of the future. The butter factories in my own electorate have never had such a large turnover, nor has their distribution to the farmers been so great as it is now. That has in some measure been due to the developmental work carried out by the Government in the district. There again is evidence of the result from a planned works policy, which is necessary and very desirable. The interests of the coming generation demand it. Whatever work is attempted should have solid foundations. It is necessary to inquire into such works because if they are to be successful they must be launched on a sound basis. We have, over too long a period, embarked on works without proper investigation.

Nowadays, however, as a result of the policy laid down by the Co-ordinator-General's Department, nothing is agreed to without proper investigation. This policy saves the Government and the local authorities in many instances vast sums that would otherwise be wasted because of the unsuitability of some scheme.

**Mr. Sparkes:** They have got to the stage of investigation now.

**Mr. FARRELL:** We have got to the stage when we are doing things; we have got past the stage of investigation. The hon. member knows very well that if his council has a scheme in mind that involves the spending of public money it is first thoroughly investigated by the officers of the council and then it is investigated by officers of the Department of the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works before the Treasurer is asked to make the money available. What is applicable to a local authority is applicable to the Government. If the Government wish to build a hospital or anything involving public money they do not let an architect run haywire; the matter is thoroughly investigated so that we can be sure the scheme is thoroughly sound and economic before the money is allocated to it.

The Premier must have had some satisfaction in explaining to the Opposition what was envisaged for the development of our State. I feel, with other members, that we should be very grateful, particularly to Mr. Kemp and his officers, who are doing a very great deal to help and develop our country by seeing that every scheme is economically sound. I do not think anybody will question the statement that during the time we have followed this policy we have received the approbation of the electors for the development of our State on sound economic lines.

Can anyone reasonably suggest that the investigation made into our coal reserves was not overdue? Anyone who knows anything about the coal-mining industry knows it was long overdue. Many of our own officers had not a complete knowledge of our coal potentialities and the most efficient way in which we could use them for the development of our secondary industries. From my own knowledge of our local field I know that the people associated with our coal industry are very grateful indeed for the help the Government have given them in having an investigation made into the coal resources of this State, because it gives an indication of the way in which the future development of each field should proceed. It is all very well to say that we should not have an investigation, that we should not bring experts here to tell us how to do the job, that we should have men here with sufficient knowledge to tell us what we require. We shall probably agree that that is so when we have given our own people all the facilities to enable them to qualify for those high positions. During the time this Government have been in power we have not lost any time in trying to develop the industry on the best lines possible.

**Mr. Heading:** You said it was long overdue.

**Mr. FARRELL:** I said that the investigation of the coal-mining industry was long overdue. Every mining expert will say that—that we did not know anything about our coal resources and their proper use. To a great extent we do not know how these resources can be availed of. As a result of the representations made by the Premier to the Federal Government, two German scientists were sent from the south to investigate these coal resources. No doubt the Premier will get the report they will make on their investigations. Who knows that at some later date oil will not be extracted from the coal in those areas? If we can accomplish that we shall have accomplished something in the interests of Queensland. Have the Government not done the right thing in having this aspect of the industry investigated? It is all very well to say that the Government should not have had Blair Athol investigated, that we should not have done this nor that. At least we have the satisfaction of knowing that we had the guts to do it. I would tell the Opposition that.

**Mr. Heading:** No-one disputes that.

**Mr. FARRELL:** The Opposition have been crying down this State for years. They



have been trying to damn the Government for years. Evidently the Opposition are against investigations.

I am sorry, Mr. Dunstan, that perhaps I have been a "little bit hot" on the Opposition for their criticism of a man who has done so much towards the development of this State. I do not suppose any Premier of Queensland has done so much for it as the present Premier. He has endeavoured to see that Queensland takes its rightful place among the other States of the Commonwealth and he has paid for it by a decline in his health. Everybody is very grateful for seeing him here occupying his place in this Chamber again and enjoying better health. The Opposition should at least give the Government credit for having enough common sense not to make mistakes similar to those they made when in office. In future, whatever we do for the development of this country will be investigated before it is embarked on to make sure that it is economically sound and in the interests of the people and the State. If we do that we shall have a continuance of the support of the people.

**Mr. Sparkes** interjected.

**Mr. FARRELL:** The hon. member for Aubigny knows more about the beef resources of this State than I, and will readily understand the enormous value of the investigation made into the cattle industry, and the benefit it will be to the people of the State and those engaged in the industry. Knowing these things, he is at all times prepared to criticise the Government.

**Mr. Jesson:** He is a knocker.

**Mr. FARRELL:** Yes, he is a knocker. I must congratulate the Premier on the persistency of his advocacy on behalf of this State. He has not spared himself in any way. He has gathered about him officers who have been most loyal in investigating everything that has been put before them for investigation.

I feel that every hon. member has a great regard for Mr. Kemp, for his outstanding ability and the work he has done on behalf of the State. He has been a tower of strength, not only to the Government but to members generally. He has tendered advice from time to time, not only to members of this Parliament but to local authorities. He has associated with him some remarkable officers who are doing magnificent work. I repeat that the criticism levelled by the Opposition at investigations made into various projects in Queensland is not warranted. Thinking over the matter, I feel that they will at least realise there is much merit in the Government's policy that before any project is undertaken it should be properly investigated and approved of by men of the calibre of Mr. Kemp.

**Mr. LOW** (Coorooora) (4.40 p.m.): One matter to which I should like to draw attention is the number of justices of the peace appointed in country districts. The present number is insufficient to meet the demands of

the times through which we are passing, in which it is necessary to fill in so many forms requiring signatures to be witnessed. I do not know whether other hon. members are in the same position as I am, but I have between 12 and 14 names on my waiting list, with three more submitted only this week. Only yesterday I was approached by representatives of one part of my electorate, who pointed out that there was now no justice of the peace there, the older residents having retired to the seaside. I suggest that a greater quota of justices of the peace be given to the country districts. If this could be done, it would be possible to overtake the present lag and the convenience of our citizens would be met.

Again, in some areas, there may be certain persons who are justices of the peace but who are not known to the other residents as justices and I suggest that from time to time up-to-date lists of justices of the peace be posted in petty sessions offices and police stations. Of course, in these days those who are already justices of the peace do not advertise the fact very freely because if they did they would soon become inundated with requests to witness signatures. I again urge the Government to reconsider the number of the justices appointed to country areas in particular.

I congratulate the Government on inducing Mr. Kemp to relinquish his post of Commissioner of Main Roads, not because he is incapable but because he had so much work to do that he was unable to give to the Main Roads Commission the time such an important department required. His knowledge and ability will be of great value in his position as Co-ordinator-General of Public Works.

Various hon. members have referred to the blue-prints and plans that are prepared from time to time. Although some work may be in progress in some parts of the State, I find the whole process painfully slow. One's patience becomes exhausted waiting for something to be done. I suggest that the preparation of these plans and blue-prints be speeded up and all unnecessary delays be abolished. One matter in which this delay is proving extremely irksome is the water-supply project for the near North Coast. Everyone must admit that if the near North Coast is to be developed a water supply is essential. For two years now investigations of underground supplies and the preparation of blue-prints have been going on but we are no further advanced than when we started. Little or no information has been available and we feel that this undue delay is causing great concern amongst local authorities and people generally. I hope that the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works will make a thorough investigation of this matter with a view of arriving at an early decision and expediting the reticulation of water throughout the North Coast area.

I know that the Premier, as well as other hon. members, realise the importance of our agricultural, horticultural and industrial shows and I ask the hon. gentleman to give consideration to the subsidising of the various show societies in order that they may



improve their grounds and buildings. These shows are of great advantage to the State not only from the competitive point of view but for the educational interest taken in them. I believe that the department could grant subsidies to these societies; I am sure each show society is urgently in need of funds for extending its activities. It would be money well spent. The Chief Secretary's Department might also assist with regard to the inter-district competition. I often wonder, when attending various shows throughout the country, at the amount of work and money involved in staging these district exhibits. It must cost the people concerned a great deal of money. But much benefit is derived by the State from inter-district competition.

The Premier's Department could help and encourage junior district competitions to be run in conjunction with the junior farmers' clubs that are being formed. It must be remembered that the junior members will eventually become the stalwarts of our agricultural industries and responsible for the production of our produce in the future. Everyone, from the Prime Minister down, realises the importance of these A. H. and I. shows and competitions. I am sure the Government sufficiently appreciates their importance as to make financial help available to improve their buildings and beautify their grounds which are mostly public reserves.

**Mr. JESSON (Kennedy) (4.49 p.m.):** I should like to add my congratulations to the sugar industry on the fact that the Premier will shortly be leading a delegation to England in its interests. We all realise that if the delegation is successful in getting a satisfactory price and a long-term agreement it will have done a remarkably good job for Queensland, particularly as to the development of the North from a defence point of view.

I do not want to discuss the development of North Queensland at great length. There are limitations to its development, outside the sugar industry. Sugar and perhaps cotton are the main agricultural crops of the coast areas of the North and if the Premier is successful in his mission he will have done a mighty job for the economy of both Queensland and Australia. Perhaps it will mean that a couple of new sugar mills will be required in North Queensland and if that is so I should like the Government to give careful consideration to the representations made by me and the various local bodies, including the returned soldiers, concerning the establishment of a new sugar mill on the upper Herbert River. The new mill would employ at least 300 people, apart from cane-cutters, a town of worthy dimensions would develop, and settlement generally would take place. We have suggested the upper Herbert River because there is plenty of fertile land there, an ideal climate, and adequate annual rainfall and an abundance of water in the Herbert River itself. There is a good road within a few miles of the site suggested for the new sugar mill, as well as a tramline carrying sugar direct to Lucinda Point. The proposal

has everything to commend it and if new sugar mills are contemplated I hope the Government will give careful consideration to the representations I have made from time to time.

I warmly applaud the Premier for the scolding he gave hon. members opposite for running down the products of Queensland and for virtually driving people out of the State. Hon. members opposite have never hesitated to condemn Labour Premiers and the State ever since the Labour Government were returned in 1915. One hon. member, not now a member of Parliament, always had the habit of knocking down Queensland and Queensland primary industries in favour of the Mallee country in Victoria. It is interesting to note that the hon. member left the Mallee to come to Queensland, where he later became a successful farmer. Hon. members opposite engaged in this tirade of abuse and hatred of the Labour Party merely for political propaganda. They have all been successful in their businesses. They are either successful business men or successful farmers and the position for them has never been more rosy than it is at the present time. They are always bright, happy and smiling now, but they are always ready to bite the hand that feeds them.

Let us analyse the sincerity of the screams of these people against the Government because of the Government's blue-print investigation. Hon. members opposite say that the Government have done nothing but can anyone tell me of anything that the Moore Government did during their three years of office? Did they ever do any planning in the interests of the people? There was a policy of negation—no planning, no Co-ordinator-General of Public Works, no person specially appointed to carry out the works programme of the Government. Everything was higgledy-piggledy. They did not worry about anything at all. Yet the policy of this Government has been one to plan public works steadily and move ahead by degrees to do the things that are essential in a civilised community. They are being blamed because they do not possess a magic wand to wave. The Estimates provide for the expenditure of £33,396 for the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works. This allocation is becoming larger each year. It is some proof that the work of this office of the department is growing.

**Mr. Sparkes:** We give you full marks for that.

**Mr. JESSON:** The blue-prints come from this officer's department, yet the hon. member for Aubigny is growling about it.

**Mr. Sparkes:** But that is all you do.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Dunstan):** Order!

**Mr. JESSON:** The hon. member for Aubigny has never been further north than Rockhampton or Mackay. He does not know what development is going on in the North. The hon. member should emulate certain members of the Federal Parliament who at the

invitation of this Government made a tour of the North. They were astounded at its development, the harbours it possessed, the improvements being made to them, the work on the Burdekin River bridge, the foundations that have been made for the new bridge over the Fitzroy River at Rockhampton, and the work being undertaken by the surveyors on the Burdekin dam project. If the Snowy River project was located in Queensland they would oppose it. The Opposition are only endeavouring to throw dust in the eyes of the people. Instead of pulling their legs, they should help the Government by boosting these projects for the welfare of the people.

Their attitude reminds me of a little story about a Yank. It was before the war. He was travelling in the backblocks and pulled up at a little hotel outside Muttaborra. He was there two or three days. During his stay an old bagman died. A J.P. signed the certificate of death, a coffin was made for the corpse, and the usual work associated with the burial carried out. When the casket was committed to earth, someone said, "Will someone say a prayer?" One of the gathering said the Lord's Prayer. Then the publican said, "Does anyone wish to say anything about our departed brother?" After a silence the Yank said, "If no-one wishes to say anything I will tell you something about California." (Laughter.) That is typical of the attitude of the Opposition.

The hon. member for Aubigny can waste petrol to come 300 miles along a bitumen road to Brisbane. Nevertheless he says that the Government have done nothing. Have not the Government given him security to enable him to breed stud bulls? The hon. member, when he condemns the Government, is only condemning himself. He should be honest and fair to the people. It is stupid to sit here and listen to hon. members opposite telling a tale of woe. It almost makes one shed crocodile tears. We never hear anything from them about the financial help the Government gave to their pineapple factory.

**An Opposition Member:** Tell us how much.

**Mr. JESSON:** They gave quite a lot.

The officers of the Chief Secretary's Department are at Mareeba and the tobacco-growers there have had substantial advances to put them on their feet. You never hear hon. members get up and speak about those things. It becomes very tedious listening to these woeful stories of how Queensland is going to the dogs, and it is absurd talk when people are coming here every day looking for something in which to invest their money. They are looking to this State, which is going to become the greatest State in Australia in a very few years. Despite the knockers Queensland cannot go back because it has the natural resources and a good Government. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. The people here are better fed, better clothed and more prosperous, and more athletic than in any other part of Australia. That all

goes down to good government. The industrial conditions the people enjoy and the fact that they own their own homes and have continuous employment are all factors that contribute to the welfare of the people and the building up of a great State. To use the language used by members of the Opposition, all their talk over there is a whole lot of boloney and hooney.

**Mr. HEADING (Wide Bay) (5.2 p.m.):** I was interested in the discussion on this vote. I should like to say to the hon. member for Kennedy that although he thinks it tedious to listen to criticism from this side, I am sure it would be much more tedious if we indulged in the fulsome praise of the Government that characterised the speeches of the hon. member and other hon. members on that side.

The hon. member for Maryborough said that we opposed the investigation into Blair Athol. Nothing is further from the truth. Not once have I heard any criticism of the investigation into the coal-mining industry. As a matter of fact, when the coal-mining Bill was before the House I was astounded to learn, through the speech of the hon. member for Bremer, of the conditions that existed in the mines. That hon. member talked about the lack of amenities and the prevalence of dust and the absence of baths. I was astounded that after so many years of Labour administration a Government who professed to look after the interests of the workers permitted such conditions to continue in that industry. I was quite sure that investigation should have been made into the coal-mining industry many years before it was. Because we criticise some of the actions of the Government in conceding the right to the Electric Supply Corporation (Overseas) Ltd. to take over the Blair Athol coalfield that was no evidence that we opposed the investigation into the coalmining industry. We did not, and no-one knows that better than hon. members opposite. But we believe not only in investigation, but in action afterwards.

Getting away from that subject, I will say a word or two about the remarks of the hon. member in connection with investigations into the meat industry. After reading the report of the commission about inland killing and various other things, I was never satisfied that we had got the information that we wanted so very badly. We know that the commission stated that abattoirs should be established in various towns with a population of 4,000 and over, but the information we wanted in connection with the meat industry is this: would it pay to kill cattle in Central Queensland and transport the carcasses to the coast? That is the information I want and under that heading I want to know whether it would not be possible to treat the stock in the inland area and get the carcasses onto the market in better condition than under the system operating today. Anybody who knows anything about the droving of cattle and similar problems knows that in the transport of stock over hundreds of miles there must be a considerable amount of loss in condition, weight and bloom.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Dunstan): Order! Such remarks as those would be more appropriate on the vote for the Department of Agriculture and Stock.

**Mr. HEADING:** When the hon. member for Maryborough discussed the meat industry, I felt it should come under the item of "Co-ordinator-General of Public Works." Perhaps I am not very far from the question before the Committee. However, Mr. Dunstan, I will obey your ruling. I was almost finished on the question anyhow.

Again I do not know whether you will agree with me, Mr. Dunstan, but I take it that the Peak Downs project comes under this vote and I want to say that any criticism from this side on Peak Downs was criticism on the principle of the scheme. Personally, I do not believe in socialisation in farming or the growing of stock. I believe these industries can be carried on much better by private enterprise. Members of the Government were loud in their praises of the scheme and said it was a wonderful success, but it is not possible for anybody to say it is a success this year, next year, or the year after. It will take years to prove whether it is or is not a success.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Does not that mean that the sooner we try it the better?

**Mr. HEADING:** Apparently the Premier has not heard what I said about it. I said very definitely that it would be better in the hands of settlers than as it is. I do not believe in it, and I am not at all backward in saying that I do not believe in socialisation of industry. Of course, it may be argued that it is or is not socialisation but I am satisfied that it would have been much better if that land had been thrown open to selection, particularly to selection by returned soldiers.

**Mr. Brown:** There is nothing to stop settlers from growing sorghum.

**Mr. Aikens:** Only they cannot get bags.

**Mr. Sparkes:** Only they want machines to put it in. You cannot put it in with your hands.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. HEADING:** That is an unfortunate interjection. I remember the Premier was loud in his protestations that farmers were not being inconvenienced because machinery was going to Peak Downs, but only a couple of days ago I received a letter that stated that at one time in the Goomeri district there were three headers harvesting grain sorghum. Today two of these are on Peak Downs, one header only being left in the Goomeri district. I have been endeavouring to get another machine to harvest the crops in that district. If those two headers taken to Peak Downs had been left in the district it would have been much better for the growers. By taking these machines away from private industry the Government are certainly doing a disservice to the farmers of this State.

When one realises that this Government have been in office for many years now, one is entitled to expect some results from all the investigations that have taken place and I suggest to the Premier that he take definite and prompt action on behalf of the cotton industry. I know all about the tariff investigations, which lasted for about 12 months, and while they have been going on the industry has been falling back, with the result that instead of the 13,000 bales of cotton that we did grow at one time we shall get only about 551 this year. In the interests not only of Queensland but of Australia too, this industry should be saved and it would not cost a great deal to do it now. The planting season is still with us and this is the time for action. If we do not do something immediately another year will be wasted and no cotton will be planted in this State.

I remind hon. members of the serious position that could occur if there was another conflagration like the last two wars and Australia was cut off from the rest of the world. The cotton position would then be acute. I also point out that we are now almost able to say that we can harvest cotton by machinery. The American machine that has been imported can handle 4,000 lb. of cotton a day whereas at one time it would take at least 30 men to do that. Many people in the cotton-growing areas would plant cotton today if the position were not so obscure that they are thinking of planting something else. That is not in the interests of the State and I appeal to the Premier to do something quickly.

**Mr. Roberts:** One minute you are condemning governmental interference and the next you are crying out for a subsidy.

**Mr. HEADING:** I do not know whether the hon. member knows anything about cotton, but I remind him that if the growers were assured of a price equivalent to what it costs Australia to import cotton from America today they would be happy. If we said to these people, while we are waiting for the Commonwealth Government to arrive at a decision, "It is costing us 36½d. a pound to import cotton from America; we will allow you that price until we get the result of these investigations," they would be happy. That would not mean paying a subsidy; it would merely mean the saving of the industry. Actually, the cotton people are not asking the Commonwealth Government to pay them the price it costs to import cotton from America. They are asking for 27d. a pound, and that is a reasonable request.

I conclude by appealing once again to the Premier to do something before it is too late to plant this year. If he will do that I can assure him many people will plant cotton so long as they get cost of production plus a reasonable margin of profit.

**Hon. E. M. HANLON** (Ithaca—Premier) (5.15 p.m.): I have listened with interest to the suggestions made by various hon. members.

With reference to the resignation of Mr. Lang, mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, I want to say that we all regret losing

his services. We got him from the Victorian Irrigation Commission. He is a young man with a long life of useful work ahead of him. It is perhaps better for him to start off with a new organisation and be able to see something accomplished before he retires. The Commonwealth Government have offered him the job of second-in-charge of the Snowy River project, with a salary of £3,000 a year. Apart from the salary, the position of engineer, second-in-charge, on an important job such as that is attractive, and when the man in charge retires Mr. Lang will inevitably become the head man. It is not a position to which I suppose many engineers would not aspire and we cannot blame him for accepting the position.

We have done nothing to stop Mr. Lang from getting on with his work here; in fact, he has got some things under way. The Border weirs are under way and so are those at St. George, which, although not big enough to irrigate the country are sufficient to supply an adequate water and sewerage system for the town of St. George. It is a very fine thing to have a modern water supply and sewerage system at St. George in Western Queensland.

Such ideas came into being with the advent of the present Government. Nowadays water supply and sewerage schemes, with street beauty plots, are in existence in inland towns. When I became Home Secretary in 1932 the only sewerage you could speak of was in the heart of the city, but today I think there are 20 towns with sewerage schemes or schemes under construction and there are another 20 for which plans are being prepared. There are water towers sticking up all over Queensland, as the result of the activities of the department. It took a good while to educate local authorities to provide these valuable amenities in country life. We started the system of subsidising local authorities for these works, which make life happier and more comfortable in the inland parts of the State.

Mr. Lang got on also with a small irrigation scheme on the Burdekin River, which will fit in with the major scheme and provide for 88 tobacco farms. Ten are already under occupation, and tobacco is being planted. The scheme provides for 40 acres of irrigable land for each man, but only 10 acres of cotton can be grown at a time and the growing of cotton must be rotated over four sections of the farm. Although people say that 40 acres of irrigable land is too much for one person, he can grow other crops that do not require the same labour as crops in rotation.

The prospects there are so good that one of the soil experts in the Department of Agriculture and Stock contested a ballot, won a block, and promptly resigned a position carrying a salary of £500-odd a year. He went into occupation of the block and is evidently quite satisfied that the blocks are going to be a success. The scheme depends for its water supply on one of the big holes in the Burdekin River, one of the long stretches of the Burdekin that never run dry. I am satisfied that there will be sufficient water to irrigate the 88 small farms.

**Mr. Aikens:** There must be a good deal of water underground too.

**Mr. HANLON:** There is. On the Snowy River scheme, Mr. Lang is entering into a wider field of activity. In Queensland he was starting off on the bottom rung of irrigation and water conservation and to my mind would have had an exceedingly fine vista of life's purpose. During the two years he has been with us he has not been able to get all the engineers he wanted, nor has anyone else. Mr. Kemp's job has been in operation for many years but he has only 39 engineers whereas Mr. Lang has 66. There has been no attempt by the Government to stop him from getting whatever engineers he required but they are just not available. This business of auctioning for the services of technical men is suicidal to Governments. It is not increasing the number of technical men, engineers, doctors or anyone else but it is increasing the cost to all Governments. Governments are trying to outbid each other for their services. However, the position will solve itself in a few years' time, because all the universities in Australia have pretty well doubled the number of their students and in the course of a few years the output of technical men will be greatly increased. These young fellows coming out of the universities are of a splendid type.

Let us have a look at the Burdekin bridge, one of the major bridge-construction works in this country—there are only a couple of bridges in the world of the same type. We flew a couple of our senior engineers to India to have a look at the bridges built on sand foundations over, I think, the Hugli and the Indus Rivers. The Burdekin bridge will be designed on similar lines. A young engineer named Mr. Lowe, a graduate of the Queensland University, is in charge of the job and he has half a dozen other graduates of the University with him. By the time the job is finished they will be as good engineers on bridge construction as any in Australia. The mere fact of doing one major job gives them experience, and in addition—what is more important—confidence in their capacity to undertake these major jobs. Mr. Lang, I understand, was in the designing branch of the Irrigation Commission in Victoria. He was quite a young man. We must look to young men of this type, men who can gain knowledge as they proceed. Once they have done one job they get the confidence to do the bigger ones. We have engineers engaged in the construction of the Somerset Dam, a masterpiece of organisation and work, quite capable of tackling any job in this country. It is all very well to conserve water, but to use it after it has been conserved is another question.

We are all very sorry to lose the services of Mr. Lang and I for one wish him every success. I hope the job that he has undertaken will be of great benefit to this country. God knows we need all the electric power we can get, all the water we can conserve and all the industries we can develop. There is no need for us to be sore about the fact that this job is being done in another part of the Commonwealth. It is all part of a

scheme to develop this great country. I very earnestly wish Mr. Lang a very successful career with the Snowy River scheme, just as I wish the same for all those associated with him. I trust that this scheme will be of great benefit to Australia.

I want to inform hon. members that the Burdekin dam and irrigation scheme is not one of those jobs planned by the National Works Council to be carried out at some period when some of our workers are out of employment. It is an immediate project. Mr. Kemp and his staff have been working on it over four years. The whole scheme has been placed before the Commonwealth Government, who have sent their investigating committee up to the Burdekin to examine it. Mr. Kemp, although ordered by his doctors to rest, said he would rest much better if he went up there and understood what was going on than if he stayed at home and worried about how the experts were getting on. The investigating committee went back to Canberra very much impressed with the scheme. I am very hopeful, in fact I am sure, that before this session ends we shall be introducing a Bill to authorise an agreement between the Commonwealth and State Governments not only for the construction of that dam but for the commencement of the work.

We shall have to establish a water authority up there and I have put a proposal to the Prime Minister that involves the Commonwealth Government committing themselves to 50 per cent. of the cost. The work will be carried out by a joint authority composed of one or two representatives of each Government with our own State Co-ordinator-General of Public Works as chairman. If we pressed the matter we could probably get the Federal Government to undertake the whole work on a similar basis to that on which they are undertaking the Snowy River scheme, but I do not think our people would like a new State inside Queensland controlled by the Federal Government. It is in the interests of the State that we should maintain control of the undertaking.

Surveys undertaken so far disclose that water can be reticulated from the Burdekin down as far as Bowen. The longer the survey proceeds the greater the scheme becomes. In fact, if the water was taken over the river site you could take it up North as far as Townsville. The further the surveyors go with their work the greater is their enthusiasm for the scheme. To get an idea of its magnitude, one only has to realise that the dam, when constructed, will hold twice as much water as the great Burrinjuck Dam and more water than the Snowy River project. Not one acre of good arable soil will be flooded. The dam will flood hundreds of miles of gorges and country of very little use. It will impound 4,000,000 acre-feet of water, so colossal will it be. It is impossible to visualise what that means to this State.

**An Opposition Member:** Twice as much water as is in the Sydney Harbour.

**Mr. HANLON:** I discussed the scheme this morning over the telephone with the Prime Minister. He promised to give me an

answer in time to put a Bill through the House before the end of this session. The estimate of the cost of the work is £29,000,000. That includes the storage dam and the diversion dam lower down the Burdekin, which will divert the water to the right and left and north and south. When one visualises, too, that the crops that can be grown include tobacco, cotton, rice and everything you can grow in that climate, you see that the possibilities are immense. A huge area will also be available for cattle-fattening. That area is now subject to one wet season a year, after which the grass grows rank and when it dries it is carried away by the wind. That area, if not required for growing crops, can be put to cattle-fattening, dairying and lamb-raising. The possibilities of dairying and the pig industry are immense and they will have a tremendous effect on other industries. For instance, with dairying and the pig industry and cattle-fattening the meatworks in the northern area, instead of being seasonal works, become an industry that works all the year round. And the by-products create further industries.

**Mr. H. B. Taylor:** Today the carrying capacity is 1 bullock to 25 acres.

**Mr. HANLON:** Yes. The great lamb export trade from the plains of New Zealand is a big industry. The lambs are not fed with crops, they are fed with cultivated pasturage, which makes all the difference. Instead of being left to natural grasses dependent on the seasons, they are fattened on cultivated pastures.

**An Opposition Member:** Irrigated.

**Mr. HANLON:** They are not irrigated. They do not need irrigation. There is no time of the year when the grass is not there. They cultivate it and fertilise it. You can get as big an improvement by cultivating grass properly as from cultivating any other crop properly. In the huge area from Bowen to Townsville the same change can take place.

Another side of the project is hydro-electricity. Mr. Kemp's estimate is that we can get about 42,000 kilowatts of hydro-electric power and he estimates that about 21,000 kilowatts would be required for industrial and domestic purposes in the area itself. You would have all sorts of other industries growing up. There will be pineapple and fruit canning where you can grow all the year with surety of returns. There will be 20,000-odd thousand kilowatts available for secondary industries. We hope as a result zinc metals that are now exported raw will be refined in that district. At the present time the zinc goes to Tasmania, because there is cheap electric power there to make refining a profitable process and this in itself gives us some idea of what can be done in the future in the Burdekin.

There is also the Tully Falls, begging to be turned into hydro-electric power. An outline of the survey has been made but there has been no detailed survey. The Barron can be developed more than it is now. The officers are looking at the Barron and they

are working on the Walsh River dam site and the Herbert. The hon. member for Herbert said it was in the future, and the Herbert is a definite prospect too. All those rivers have to be surveyed. We cannot afford to wait any longer to complete a stock-taking of the great assets we have. It is not much good making speeches about your resources if you are not doing something to get them measured.

That is what is going on at the present time. It was unfortunate that because of financial stringency at the time of the Dawson irrigation scheme the major dam proposal was dropped. Investigations now show that that is quite a sound proposal. In the couple of years that Mr. Lang's organisation has been building up it has done a remarkable amount of surveying and investigation and testing the water flow in all streams, and this has given us information that justifies us in spending more money. The investigations take a lot of money and when we get the evidence that justifies the expenditure, it is carried out. No matter what you are investigating, if it is not giving you encouragement to go in for a detailed scheme, you can cut your loss and pull out.

**An Opposition Member:** Because of the information you have, the Dawson demands first priority.

**Mr. HANLON:** It cannot demand a greater priority than the Burdekin. The Burdekin is a much bigger scheme and offers greater possibilities. The Burdekin is in a locality where we are hard put to it to get population and where we want to build up the population, that is, in the northern part of this State. The Burdekin scheme has already produced something. It has produced the North Queensland Development League. (Laughter.) However, this will give hon. members some indication of the work both the Irrigation Commission and the Co-ordinator-General's Department are doing on these projects. The Burdekin bridge is an outstanding job. So is the Fitzroy bridge. They are very important in the main arterial communication with the North.

Coal development will go on and if we have done nothing else we have made the coal resources of this country known to the world. Industry inevitably comes to where there is cheap coal. That is exemplified in every part of the world: where there is cheap coal, industry automatically flows to it.

The hon. member for Kennedy mentioned the possibility of new sugar mills, if we can get an increase in our export quota of sugar. Home consumption has increased. In Australia last year we used 500,000 tons and with the increasing population that figure will increase. If, in any reallocation of quotas, we can get the export quota up, say, 100,000 tons that will mean probably another two sugar mills, which in turn would mean another two sugar towns. I do not think there is any industry that gives more settlement, development and population than the sugar industry. It deserves all the encouragement we can give

it, because it is one of those industries that continually dip into their own pockets for the funds to carry on investigation into improved technique of production. It is only because it has done that that we get sugar cheaper today than we got it in the past. Even with the additional half-penny a pound we shall be paying only the same price as we were paying in the 1920's. Up to two years ago, when I was able to get one half-penny a pound increase, sugar was being sold cheaper than at any time in the history of Queensland since the sugar industry started. The sugar industry has done a remarkably good job. If we took the sugar industry away from the North there would be a very serious collapse of the population there.

The hon. member for Cooroora mentioned the position in regard to justices of the peace. I can scarcely believe that there is a real shortage. There may be a shortage in a particular spot but I would point out that there are 20,400 justices of the peace in Queensland. I was staggered when I looked at these figures. This means an average of about 400 justices of the peace to each electorate or one justice of the peace for every 35 adults in Queensland. I know the hon. member for Cooroora has seven nominations in. Hon. members are entitled to nominate four men as justices of the peace every quarter, so that his nominations will be cleaned up in the December roll. If anybody is urgently required all the hon. member has to do is to write and say which four he wants appointed. If he urgently needs the others I think he will find that in his party there are some members who did not nominate their four for the quarter. These nominations are put through every three months and frequently I notice that some hon. members have not nominated their four. If the hon. member makes inquiries among his colleagues he may find among them someone who does not want his quota urgently. With four per member a quarter, that is 16 a year for each member, and with 62 members—and next year it will be 75—so that the proportion of justices of the peace will be bigger again. Hon. members will see that the appointments are numerous. There is no harm in having justices of the peace, but I was rather staggered to hear there was a shortage of them because I thought there was an over-supply. If the hon. member will tell the Under Secretary of the Chief Secretary's Department which of the nominees he wants appointed they will be appointed, in the way I have suggested. Of course, if he does not make that known the appointments will be made in the order in which the nominations are made.

As to Peak Downs, the hon. member for Wide Bay can be assured that the corporation will make every effort to see that it is a success. Even if the undertaking itself is not a success I believe it will have been of great value to Queensland in that in the first place it will have shown whether or not it can be a success. If we do not try we shall never find out these things; we shall never accomplish anything. Already it has done something, in that it is making the graziers

on the black-soil country in the reasonable rainfall belt fodder-conscious. Even now these graziers are beginning to plant sorghum because they are beginning to realise it is wrong to allow stock to starve when they can grow a few acres with reasonable success. They are finding that by feeding a few pounds of sorghum a day to the cattle they top off very quickly indeed. Their experience of past years, waiting for whole herds to top off, and then getting a bad spin and getting none to top off at all, is making them experiment with feeding. So that whether the undertaking is a success or not, if it makes the graziers generally fodder-conscious, if it makes them decide that they are not going to leave the care of their cattle any longer to God but are going to do a little bit themselves, it will have been of advantage to this State.

There has been too much of this "leaving it to God" business in the past. If the rain does not come and the cattle die their attitude has been to let them die—in agony. One of the absurdities that has always struck me in this country is the way in which people will prosecute the farmer who sends a dozen chickens to market in a crate that will hold only eight but look with complete complacency at millions of sheep and hundreds of thousands of cattle dying in the agonies of hunger and thirst. Why, when one hon. member of the Opposition, a dairyman, spoke in this Chamber recently during a drought and spoke about the need for some more Socialism for the anti-Socialists—free fodder for starving stock—he was asked by interjection what he was doing, if he was feeding his cattle, and he said he was feeding the young stock but the old ones would have to take their chance. If the rain came the old stock would be saved, but if the rain did not come each and every one of the old cattle would die in the most dire agony of hunger and thirst. He did not want to shoot them to get them out of their misery or send them in for slaughter for pig-meat or fertiliser, because it might rain! He was prepared to gamble the lives and sufferings of hundreds of animals against the possibility that the rain would come!

This is one of the few countries in the world in which it is difficult to get the producer fodder-conscious. If they would become fodder-conscious there would be a big reduction in drought losses. I know perfectly well there are areas in which it would be impossible to grow fodder—owing to the very low rainfall, and that coming at very uncertain times—but there are areas where it could be done. There are areas on all those western rivers where, by weiring, a reasonable amount of irrigation fodder could be grown. Weiring is being undertaken to irrigate up to 1,200 acres for the growing of lucerne. Once lucerne is grown there will be no need to hand-feed in that area. Wherever the weirs are constructed a contribution will be made sooner or later to saving the tragic loss of sheep that has taken place over the years. If in those areas where they have summer rains for perhaps three out of every five years attempts are made to put

in fodder crops we shall lessen the losses in cattle that occur periodically. Only the other day, when a pastoralist was getting a renewal of his lease, he was asked about putting a certain area under fodder. He had undertaken to do some £40,000 worth of improvements and he cheerfully accepted a condition in his lease that he would put in 500 acres of sorghum every year. If we can get that attitude established and get rid of the attitude of asking, "Will it save me a few shillings to let the cattle die rather than spend money to grow fodder for them?", we shall see results and we shall not witness the ghastly spectacle of thousands of animals starving every year.

I know very well that some country will not grow sorghum. I listened in the Longreach Club in 1927 to an argument between some of the larger sheep men out there, men shearing 20,000, 30,000 and 40,000, and one over 100,000 sheep. One man was laughing at the others for feeding their sheep and kept on saying, "You will be sorry; I have the money to stock up again when it is over." Fancy a man being so callous as to say he would let 100,000 beasts die of hunger! You can understand him paying a man to shoot them, but to let 100,000 die and restock later on and criticise as stupid the other fellow for his efforts to save the lives of his stock—

**Mr. Russell** interjected.

**Mr. HANLON:** I will not discuss the missing link with the hon. member. I was stating the attitude adopted in the past. With the cutting up of the larger estates a lot of that attitude has gone.

**Mr. Sparkes:** And you had less sheep as soon as you cut them up.

**Mr. HANLON:** Believe me, that attitude is going. Sooner or later the public conscience will make it go. If economics do not make that sort of thing die out the conscience of the people will. I can see everywhere in the country a change of outlook. When I went out to the construction of the St. George weir I found that the graziers were thrilled that they were to have irrigation and were eager to show what could be done. They even discussed the possibilities of putting weirs at other parts to grow lucerne to provide feed against the time of drought. That sort of thing will make for the security of the pastoral industry in this country. In the past there were those who were prepared to take what providence gave them and make no attempt at real husbandry. That is passing away and a new era is coming into the grazing industry because the importance of conserving fodder is being realised.

I do not think that Peak Downs itself will be a failure. I do not know of many farmers who made a profit the first year they were on their farms. I do not think that any hon. member opposite can say that in the first year he was on new country he made a profit. Peak Downs made a profit, and a profit on the sum invested, too. I think that is more than any farmer opposite can say.



It has not done as big a job as we had hoped; it struck misfortune. Has any hon. member opposite never struck misfortune?

**Mr. Sparkes** interjected.

**Mr. HANLON:** Has the hon. member himself never struck misfortune? Will he say that he should be driven off his land because he has had droughts and his cattle have died? Is it a crime that the management of the Queensland-British Food Corporation should have struck an unfavourable season? Is that any reason why it should be abandoned? Does the hon. member say that he should be thrown off his land every time he strikes an unfavourable season? You cannot have one moral obligation to apply to Peak Downs that does not apply to everyone else.

**Mr. Sparkes:** They struck one of the best seasons.

**Mr. HANLON:** The hon. member in his superior way wants one law for himself and another law for other people, but I as head of the Government say that the same moral law shall apply to all. If it is wrong for Peak Downs to miss a crop, then it is wrong for every farmer to miss a crop. The testing time will come later on. I have heard reference to Peak Downs and what the farmers could have done with the machinery that Peak Downs had. Every implement of machinery on Peak Downs produced twice as much as the small farmer would have produced.

**Mr. Sparkes:** How do you know that?

**Mr. HANLON:** I have the report from the people operating them. The standard of intelligence amongst the people operating the machinery at Peak Downs was just as high as the standard of intelligence of the hon. member. Mr. Young, Mr. Kemp and the men working under them did a very fine job and the hon. member must understand that these people can do simple arithmetic—they can divide the number of acres cultivated by the number of implements used. They did twice as much as any farmer in the country can show.

The chairman of the Country Party, Mr. Campbell, says that he is going in for large-scale sorghum-planting. Another person in the Northern Territory has advertised that he will put in 10,000 acres of sorghum. He is of the opinion that the rainfall in his area is as good as that at Peak Downs. If Peak Downs does nothing else but teach the people to grow fodder to feed sheep and cattle in a dry time and thus prevent their loss it will have been worth while.

**Mr. HILEY (Logan) (5.54 p.m.):** I am sure every hon. member will be glad to have heard the statement by the Premier concerning the reasons for the resignation of Mr. Lang, the Commissioner of Irrigation and Water Supply, all the more so because the statement that appeared in the Press impressed me and many people—

**Mr. Hanlon:** Which one?

**Mr. HILEY:** The statement that appeared in the Press giving the reasons

for Mr. Lang's resignation. From the statement that the Premier made today one would imagine that there were no other circumstances behind the resignation than purely the lure of a bigger job. I think we are entitled to know all the circumstances, and seeing that the vote provides the money for the Department of the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works, there is a relation between this vote and the resignation of Mr. Lang.

I believe that one of the factors that led to Mr. Lang's resignation is that the Government had broken his heart in the scope of his job. The reason why they have broken his heart is this: there are four authorities that enter into the building of large-scale dams. Mr. Lang's department is permitted to touch certain aspects of the work but as soon as a decent-size dam is to be built the Commissioner of Irrigation and Water Supply is told, "You must not be allowed to touch this work; it will be built by the Co-ordinator-General's Department." In other words, he is prohibited from constructing large projects.

Then you have local authorities building works for the storage of water and when the State Electricity Commission embarks on the Tully Falls scheme, which the Premier has spoken of, you again have a completely separate construction authority. There you have got to the root of some of the difficulties of the Commissioner of Irrigation and Water Supply. He says, "Whose job is it to build dams and impound water? Is it to be the responsibility of the Commissioner of Irrigation and Water Supply, or is it to be the function of some other authority?"

That is No. 1 difficulty. The Estimates are exceedingly relevant to the second difficulty. We have before us the vote for the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works, which includes a number of graded positions for engineers, while elsewhere in the votes, on page 61, we have the gradings of engineers for the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply. These show the difference in the salary classifications. At page 11 of the Estimates the salaries of the Engineering and Technical Staff of the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works are set out. There are no gradings for Engineer, Division I., in that department, but if you turn to page 61, the vote of the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply, it will be seen that an Engineer, Division I., is paid no more than £932. That salary is £50 less than Engineer, Division II., in the Co-ordinator-General's Department is receiving. In many cases, a Grade I. Engineer in the Irrigation Department is paid as low as £807. Although his grade is one grade higher, he is paid £150 less than Grade II. Engineer in the Co-ordinator-General's Department.

If you turn to Division II., Engineers, in the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply, you will find that the salaries range from £782—that is the highest appropriation restricted to engineers—down to as low as £557. That compares with £957 for an Engineer, Division II., in the Co-ordinator-General's Department.



When you come to Grade III., Engineers, the disparity is not so great, although you do find some advantage in the Co-ordinator-General's Department as compared with the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply. When you come to the humble cadets you will find the salary of the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works cadets is £350, while the lowest salary of the cadet in the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply is £160. That is less than one half.

There you have the background for some of the factors that have given rise to this discontent, or rather the factors contributing to Mr. Lang's discontent, which have helped to his resignation. It is quite true that any man who is ambitious is lured by greater opportunities and higher salary, but it is equally true that if a man is first made to feel contented he often forgets that factor and it is only when he becomes discontented that he begins to examine it to see where his best prospects lie.

It is not part of my purpose to suggest that the range of salaries paid to the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works and staff should be reduced because they are above those of the Irrigation Department. My purpose is to point out that the disparity is there, and they are very noticeable as you scan the Estimates, and that is having an effect on the outlook and state of satisfaction of the engineers working in that department. If in fact we are experiencing difficulty in commanding the services of efficient engineers to carry out the very fine projects that are listed we sooner or later shall have to face up to the issue that if we want good men we shall have to pay for them.

Having made those observations I say this: the Premier has paid a very gracious tribute to Mr. Lang's qualities and the work he was beginning to carry out for this State. He has gone. There will be a successor, and I hope and we all hope he will be a man of equal qualities. We have to discover whether the factors that may have contributed to Mr. Lang's leaving are to be allowed to continue or whether they are going to be corrected to avoid any suggestion of making his successor equally discontented. There is something wrong with an approach that says to a Commissioner of Irrigation and Water Supply, "You have the title of Commissioner of Irrigation and Water Supply; we will allow you to build the little dam on the Walsh River but you are not to touch the big one on the Burdekin; that is for the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works." If we are to ask a man to be the Commissioner of Irrigation and Water Supply and give him that title we have to give him the responsibility that should go with the title. He should be the No. 1 man on that class of work; and if we do that I think we shall succeed in attracting men of equal quality to Mr. Lang and holding them in the service of the State.

**Hon. E. M. HANLON** (Ithaca—Premier) (7.18 p.m.): I cannot allow the statement made by the hon. member to go without having something to say on it. First of

all, he tried to make out that Mr. Lang's resignation from the Department of Irrigation shows that there is something wrong with the administration of the department.

**Mr. Hiley:** Who said that?

**Mr. HANLON:** You.

**Mr. Hiley** interjected.

**Mr. HANLON:** The hon. member has not Mr. Lang's authority for making that statement; I am sure Mr. Lang would not agree with the hon. member.

**Mr. Hiley:** That may be so.

**Mr. HANLON:** He is a very able man, and he knows his work. The hon. member has stated that there is a disparity between the salaries paid in the Department of the Co-ordinator-General and in the Department of the Commissioner of Irrigation and Water Supply. That is not true; it is not so at all. The salaries for the engineers in the various divisions are identical. That is one of the major difficulties in the Public Service—you have to keep salaries identical for the same class of work. The alteration of any classification in any one department usually brings about a whole series of alterations throughout the service in order to keep people doing equal work or carrying equal responsibility on the same salaries. The hon. member is taking the actual figures quoted in the Estimates—the amount I am asking Parliament to vote as the salaries and classification they are on. If you look through the classifications you will find that they are identical. The only difference is in the case of the chief engineer. The chief engineer, Irrigation and Water Supply Department, is on a classification of £1015/£1300. The chief engineer, Somerset Dam, Mr. Nimmo, is on a classification of £1,200/£1,400 a year. He has been a long time in the service of the State. He is a very senior engineer and nobody with any knowledge would suggest that there is no difference between the salary paid to a man of long and faithful service to the Government and a man who, in comparison with Mr. Nimmo's service, is comparatively a newcomer. Mr. Nimmo has graduated through long and very faithful service to the Government and has risen to that salary.

Getting away from the chief engineer, we find that the deputy chief engineer, Department of Irrigation and Water Supply, has a classification of £1,200 a year: the chief engineer, the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works Department, £1,000 to £1,200 a year. It then comes down through the divisions, senior engineers, executive engineers, designing engineers, engineers, Divisions 1, 2 and 3 with the same classifications. Where the hon. member is confused is that the men in the Co-ordinator-General's Department are at the top of their classification. They have been longer in the service, whereas the other men are going up in their salary rates by rises of £100 or £50, as the case may be.

**Mr. Hiley:** What would be the salary of the Division 2 engineer?

**Mr. HANLON:** £625 to £750 a year.

**Mr. Hiley:** Why then, on page 11 of the Estimates, Division 2 engineer, Stanley River Works, £957? This is to be found in the middle of page 11.

**Mr. HANLON:** He is senior designing engineer. He has been in the service for goodness knows how many years and has reached the classification maximum of £1,100.

**Mr. Hiley:** Then he is wrongly described here. He is described as engineer, Division 2, £957.

**Mr. HANLON:** The designing engineer in the Sub-department of Irrigation and Water Supply is on £930/£1,100, the same as he is.

**Mr. Hiley:** No, the Division 2 engineer?

**Mr. HANLON:** The hon. member said "designing engineer."

**Mr. Hiley:** No, Division 2 engineer.

**Mr. HANLON:** Oh, he is on a special job. That is Mr. Napier, who is resident at the Stanley River Dam and in charge. His classification with the department is Division 2 engineer. The classification of all these others is exactly the same. Divisions 1, 2 and 3 in both the services are exactly the same; some of the titles are different. Taking them by and large, an endeavour has been made all through to keep the salaries even.

I come now to Mr. Lang himself. I want to make it clear that there is no ill-feeling in this matter. Mr. Lang has been most helpful. He has worked out for the guidance of myself and his Minister what he suggests should be done in the department. He has suggested, as a result of his experience, how we should alter the administration, and so on. He has not got all the engineers he wanted, and no Government in Australia have all the engineers they want. I do not suppose any private employer has all the engineers he wants, but he has suggested improvements in the organisation whereby we can get better service.

I do not think Mr. Lang ever expected that Mr. Kemp and his organisation, who have been working on the Burdekin main dam for over four years, should be pushed aside to let him in. As a matter of fact, it was on Mr. Kemp's recommendation that an Irrigation Commission was appointed, and actually it was as a result of Mr. Kemp's work that the whole of the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply was set up. All hon. members know what a poor thing the old Sub-Department of Irrigation and Water Supply was. Mr. Kemp and his organisation have been working on the Burdekin main dam since 1945. One of the first things started on when I took over the Acting Premiership was the investigation of that area. Mr. Kemp has brought the plan to fruition and I am going to say now that if there was a difference of opinion between Mr. Lang and Mr. Kemp in advice tendered I should accept Mr. Kemp's advice because he has greater and wider experience. He has been a long and faithful guider

of the Government of this State in a multitude of operations. He has a wider experience in every way and he is more mature. If it came to a difference of opinion between Mr. Lang and Mr. Kemp I think I can say, without in any way reflecting on Mr. Lang himself, that I do not think Mr. Lang would expect the Government to take his advice against that of Mr. Kemp.

**Mr. Low:** You deny that he had a row with a senior Minister?

**Mr. HANLON:** He has only the one Minister. The Secretary for Public Lands and Irrigation is his Minister and I do not know of any public servant who is more friendly with his Minister than Mr. Lang. He has also been very helpful. As a matter of fact, Mr. Lang has submitted to the Minister, and to me, a report on the whole of the department. In it he makes of his own accord suggestions for improvement in the administration, and we are grateful to him for it.

I do not think anybody has a right to attach any stigma to Mr. Lang or to the Minister, or to suggest that there is any ill-feeling in it. It is a rather pitiable thing if hon. members are going to make political football of a very efficient and very honourable public servant.

As I said before, Mr. Lang is going to a job that is bigger. The man in charge of the Snowy River dam is on a £5,000 salary. People throughout the world are inclined to judge a man's capacity by the salary he earns. Mr. Lang is a young man, much younger than the man in charge, and, being second in command, he eventually must succeed to that position and I think he would be very foolish and very unwise if he did not seize that opportunity of being head of the biggest engineering undertaking in the Commonwealth.

**Mr. Decker:** Are you likely to lose any more?

**Mr. HANLON:** I do not know. Victoria lost Mr. Lang. He was originally research engineer, Department of Water Supply, Victoria, in 1944 and his salary was £592. In 1947 he was assistant chief designing engineer of Victoria on a salary range of £900 to £1,000, and that year we appointed him to Queensland at a salary of £1,560. When we offered him a bigger salary than he was getting down there to come to our job, I do not suppose we can complain if someone else offers him a bigger salary again to leave us.

**Mr. Sparkes:** You did complain at the start of your speech at the outbidding by one State.

**Mr. HANLON:** Mr. Lang was appointed on Mr. Kemp's recommendation and I regret that hon. members are trying to make out that there is ill-feeling between Mr. Lang and the Minister in charge of the department. I do not know of any Minister who is on more friendly terms with his officers than Mr. Foley.

**Mr. Sparkes:** There is no suggestion.

**Mr. HANLON:** I thought there was that suggestion. I say quite frankly that on the advice of Mr. Lang considerable changes in administration are being made. This advice was given to us since he put in his resignation. He wants to give us all the help he can to get the department organised on a better basis than it is and probably as a result of his advice an amending Bill will be introduced into Parliament. It is wrong to suggest that Mr. Lang is leaving because of ill-feeling, or that there is ill-feeling between him and the Minister. I repeat that I do not know of any Minister who is on more friendly terms with the heads of his departments than the Secretary for Public Lands.

I had overlooked the fact that one hon. member mentioned the cotton industry. The Press reports that the Federal Government are rejecting the proposal to appoint a Select Committee to investigate the cotton industry. They are sticking to the recommendations made by the Tariff Board but intend wiping out that old man of the sea—that £60,000 loan—that has been hanging round the necks of cotton-growers for some time. The import price of cotton is 37.9 pence a pound and the cotton-growers were asking for 32 pence. Under devaluation the price of imported cotton is 5.9 pence a pound more than the men asked the Government to give them. The hon. member who spoke said that if they could get import parity they would be happy. I am saying that the import parity is 37.9 pence a pound, whereas only a few weeks ago they were asking for 32 pence.

**Mr. Brand:** Thirty-two pence for five years or 37 pence for one year?

**Mr. HANLON:** I think they would be foolish to take 32 pence. Is the hon. member suggesting that sterling will rise suddenly and that this socialistic Government who are ruining Great Britain will suddenly raise it and restore parity with the dollar?

**Mr. Brand:** I am only going on what you said. There is no guaranteed period of years?

**Mr. HANLON:** No.

**Mr. Morris:** They are getting 32 pence now?

**Mr. HANLON:** No. I said that the import price was 37.9 pence and that the growers were asking for 32 pence and that the value of cotton today is 5.9 pence higher than the amount they were asking for. They are not getting a guarantee for any period and it looks as if sterling would not come back to dollar parity for some time. In addition, the Commonwealth Government are wiping out the debt of £60,000, the interest and redemption of which has been a tremendous difficulty to the small number of cotton-growers in the industry. That debt has been wiped out altogether.

**Mr. SPARKES (Aubigny) (7.35 p.m.):** The Premier is usually on sound grounds, or endeavours to make his ground very firm under him. We all know that he is able to

twist and turn things to suit himself. I take exception to a statement by the Premier today. He was wide of the mark and out of his depth when he said that the machines used on the Queensland-British Food Corporation project would do more work there than if they were used by the Downs farmers. At least one is justified in concluding from that remark that the hon. gentleman is out of touch with the Downs farmers. I am prepared to admit that perhaps the machines could go over more ground at Peak Downs, they might scratch the ground in all sorts of ways, but it is the yield that counts. The test is not how far they go or how much they do, but the return obtained from the area worked. I can assure the Premier that the Downs farmers will produce more grain to the acre than the Peak Downs scheme is ever likely to produce.

I rose mainly to join issue with the Premier about his statement that graziers allowed their sheep to die. The Premier said in effect that the graziers were delighted to see them dying in that way. What an absurd statement from a man who holds the important position of Premier of Queensland—to say that we look on with glee when we see the sheep dying! No one has ever heard a more absurd statement in his life.

**Mr. Hanlon:** It is true.

**Mr. SPARKES:** When the Premier spoke about sheep dying in the drought he pointed to me. Yes, I have seen them die, and there is no more pitiful sight, especially when you know that within 200 miles there is plenty of feed for them, but no transport to get them there. I say that the Government are the greatest killers of sheep and cattle in this State. Why have the Government not built the connecting link between Charleville and Blackall, which the graziers have advocated from time immemorial? More sheep die in the Blackall, Longreach, and surrounding districts in one year than the cost of building this connecting link would represent. It is very easy for the hon. gentleman to get up and say that the grazier should grow sorghum to feed his sheep. He is the worst offender. He will say now that no rails and other things are available, but he has been sitting there for well over 20 years, a prominent man in the Government.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Do not exaggerate.

**Mr. SPARKES:** With one exception the Labour Government have been in power for over 30 years.

**Mr. Hanlon:** I have been only 18 years on this bench.

**Mr. SPARKES:** For 18 years he has allowed the sheep to die under these appalling conditions, and he has not lifted one hand to build this connecting link. Ask the hon. member for Barecoo and the hon. member for Warrego. Thousands of sheep have died in the Longreach district in different droughts.

**Mr. Hanlon:** We carry them for miles—into Rockhampton, down the coast, and again out West.

**Mr. SPARKES:** The Premier is prompted by the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock, who apparently knows less about the position than the Premier himself. What a wonderful thing to do—to carry the sheep from Longreach to Rockhampton—down the coast and out West, thousands of miles, when, if the link was built you could take them 200 miles to the feed! If that is so, they nevertheless die in thousands. And what of the cost? What an argument to put up—that they cart them to Rockhampton, down the coast, and out West to the Bollon, or wherever the feed is!

**Mr. Hanlon:** You know they carried them for nearly nothing.

**Mr. SPARKES:** The Premier said, "We brought cattle from the West down to the coast." What is the use of bringing cattle from the West, which is a clean area, to the coast in order to let them die of redwater, when they could have been saved to the industry and the State had this 200-mile connecting link been constructed? The hon. gentleman should have stuck to his Blair Athol project and left the graziers alone, for he has walked into something he knows nothing about. I should like to see him for a period of years established on one of the small sheep areas his Government created. They were anxious to put the selectors on them to starve. He would then know what the graziers had to put up with.

The Premier appears to be beginning to make excuses for Peak Downs. I have never risen in this Chamber and condemned the Peak Downs project. The Premier has made the excuse tonight that the Peak Downs project will give an impetus to the grazier to grow sorghum for his stock. Most of our stock losses are in the dry inland areas. If the Premier will go out into those areas and grow sorghum for them it will be an interesting experiment indeed. How much sorghum has the Queensland-British Food Corporation got stored at Peak Downs to feed its 17,000 head of cattle? It has not one grain stored for that purpose. All the sorghum that has been fed to the cattle was what lay on the ground and which was not harvested. Then the Premier told us that the graziers lacked knowledge of their industry.

How much sorghum did the Queensland Government store when they owned State stations? None at all. The Government of the day were going to show the grazier how to run his business. They paid neither rent nor taxes on their station properties but competed with the grazier. What happened? They lost £2,500,000.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I have allowed the hon. member an opportunity to reply to the statements made by the Premier. I now ask him to confine his remarks to discussing the vote under discussion.

**Mr. SPARKES:** I bow to your ruling, Mr. Mann. The Premier in his usual manner got up and said that he was trying to help someone on this side of the Chamber. Seeing that one of his admitted ability desires to help someone on this side, then I want to

help him. He pointed to me and said, "Can the hon. member for Aubigny say he never suffered any stock losses? Of course he can't." I have seen sheep die and I have seen cattle die, more than I should like to see, but I never gained any glee from it, as the Premier said.

**Mr. Hanlon:** I never said you got any glee from it.

**Mr. SPARKES:** It is all very well to talk of what the grazier should do, but would he have cared to be a grazier when wool brought only 6d. a pound? The graziers have done a wonderful job for Queensland and produced more wealth than any other industry. In fact, the primary industries have produced more wealth than all the secondary industries together.

**Mr. Jesson:** And employ less.

**Mr. SPARKES:** "Employ less," the hon. member says, because he knows nothing of the far-western areas. I want to say that these people have done a good job and it ill becomes the hon. gentleman to speak of them in that way. If the hon. gentleman would use his influence to help the industry instead of trying to bear down the price that primary industry is getting, he would be better employed. It would be better if he encouraged it as the other countries do such as Argentina, the United States of America, and even Britain. Instead of decrying the price, they encourage the industry. When the industry is encouraged it should give the best possible conditions to those employed in it; but if the owner is working under starvation conditions how can he give better conditions to his employees? That is happening in the western districts where the Government make the areas too small and the owners are not able to give the wages and conditions—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. SPARKES:** I want to draw the attention of the Premier to the amount of £11,228, haulage of galvanised iron piping by road and rail, Newcastle to Brisbane. I presume a large amount of it must have been by road.

**Mr. Hanlon:** None of it that came by road came by boat.

**Mr. SPARKES:** Is that so? I am glad the hon. gentleman told me that. It would probably be possible to get it up by boat after the recent rain. I am glad of that information; it is a wonderful discovery the hon. gentleman made.

What I want to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to is the fact that apparently the Government could bring up galvanised piping, yet the merchant in the country town could not obtain a permit to bring it up for the primary producer who wanted it in order to keep the cattle alive. The Government brought it up and apparently it was used for the Housing Commission. It would not be likely to get to any primary industry; you can bet your life on that.

**An Opposition Member:** Peak Downs.

**Mr. SPARKES:** The hon. member says "Peak Downs."

**Mr. Hanlon:** How you hate Peak Downs!

**Mr. SPARKES:** The hon. gentleman cannot truthfully say that I have got up and made one remark against Peak Downs. I challenge the hon. gentleman to prove it.

**Mr. Hanlon:** You just said it now.

**Mr. SPARKES:** I just said it now? I say there is no possible chance of a man working for the Queensland-British Food Corporation to produce the grain that could be produced by the individual farmer on the Downs. I stick to that. I have a better knowledge of farming, and I bet that my friend the hon. member for Cunningham, given the tractors and ploughs, would produce more than anyone on Peak Downs. They will go round and scratch the ground but they will not plough and fallow it as my friend the hon. member for Cunningham, a practical farmer, would do. The Premier said that even if Peak Downs is a failure, at least it has shown it can grow sorghum. He is now starting to water it down. I would remind the Premier that the Government had a State farm at Gindie. Of course, it never paid its way—no Government thing ever does. The hon. gentleman knows jolly well that a big part of that farm, or a part of it at any rate, has been acquired.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member might discuss that on the Vote for the Department of Agriculture and Stock.

**Mr. SPARKES:** Very well, it will keep. The hon. gentleman has to get a hiding eventually. Sooner or later he must take it and I thought the sooner he was corrected and shown where he was wrong the better for him. I hate to see the Premier standing up and making statements that show he has not a full knowledge of what he is talking about. That is why I draw the hon. gentleman's attention to these little points tonight. However, Mr. Mann, since you have ruled as you have, I have nothing further to say. I will leave that matter until the Estimates for the Department of Agriculture and Stock are under review.

**Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca—Premier)** (7.51 p.m.): Hon. members opposite always see Peak Downs sitting on the bed rail haunting them. It is really very amusing. I would call the attention of hon. members to a statement made by the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock, that the estimates prepared in his department show that the crop harvested at Peak Downs per machine, was a great deal greater, even after damage done by frost, than the amount harvested by the average machine on the Darling Downs.

**Mr. McIntyre:** Grain or acreage?

**Mr. HANLON:** I am referring to the grain. I am talking about the crop.

**Mr. Sparkes:** They would not bother putting their machines into some of the crop I saw at Peak Downs.

**Mr. HANLON:** That is the hon. member's idea of that project. The department's estimate is: in a record wheat crop on the Darling Downs the average wheat harvested per machine was 3,114 bushels. At Peak Downs, though the crop was stricken with frost and only 320,000 bushels were harvested, the harvest per machine was 10,666 bushels. I am referring to the average harvest of grain per machine, 10,666 bushels, as against a wheat harvest on the Darling Downs per machine of 3,114 bushels.

The complete horror of hon. members opposite at the Peak Downs experiment is rather amusing to me. Member after member of the Country Party stands in this Chamber and with knees knocking and bones rattling starts to sing a song of terror about Peak Downs. What I said a while ago is true: Peak Downs will show a profit on the money invested in it, even though the amount of grain that it was thought would be harvested was not harvested.

**Mr. Sparkes:** Last year?

**Mr. HANLON:** Taking the crop—the plant was in one part and the crop in the other. Taking the crop yield they will show a profit on it. It is unfortunate that the crop was not as great as was at first thought.

Then we have the reference of the hon. member for Aubigny to the transport of butt-welded piping from Newcastle. Here we have "Socialism for me but not for the other fellow."

He says "Give us Socialism for me but not for anyone else. Let everybody serve me but not serve anybody else." We brought 2,500 tons of piping from Newcastle to Brisbane by road. We got the opportunity to take it. It was not really allocated to us at all.

**Mr. Chalk:** It was still portion of Queensland's quota, though.

**Mr. HANLON:** We got just as much after it as we had been getting before it.

**Mr. Hiley:** Who will use that piping?

**Mr. HANLON:** The various departments. I think some went to local authorities, some to the Housing Commission and some to public works, and this allowed other piping to go to the people who wanted it.

**Mr. Sparkes:** Why did you not let them bring it up?

**Mr. HANLON:** They were free to bring it up but they were not free to do what they wanted to do—bring 10 tons up by truck and 200 tons by ship and then sell the whole lot on the basis that it had all been brought up by truck. If they ask the control office for permission to bring it by truck they can bring it by road today.

**Mr. Sparkes:** That is today.

**Mr. HANLON:** It is only on the stuff that they can bring by road that they can charge the farmer or consumer the road rate. I know that the hon. member's friends in the western towns, these men who farm

the farmer, missed a very fine opportunity of charging an extra few thousand pounds to the farmers and people generally by charging the road rate on stuff that was brought up by boat. I know they missed that opportunity and are annoyed with these infernal Socialists who interfere with all sorts of people, who interfered with the shopkeeper and saw to it that he gave 16 oz. to the pound instead of selling 13-oz. tins of jam as 1-lb. tins in the old days. These Socialists interfered again and they have lost this opportunity of charging for galvanised iron, butt-welded piping, and all the rest of it at the higher rate. As long as evidence is produced that they brought the iron, piping, or anything else by road, they may pass on the cost.

**Mr. Sparkes:** That was not so until just recently.

**Mr. HANLON:** They were bringing some up by road and wanting to charge for the whole lot at the road rate.

As to butt-welded piping, I suggest that the hon. member read his Estimates. He has been discussing £11,000 for butt-welded piping paid by the Chief Secretary so that people could have their homes serviced with water and gas without being charged excessive prices, but I remind him that there is no charge for the carriage by road of butt-welded piping this year at all. The hon. member was discussing an item on last year's Estimates of expenditure, not this year's Estimates, and he did not know the difference. Hon. members will get an idea from that as to just how much notice they can take of him.

I repeat what I said before. I know the hon. member gets very sore if you suggest that any of his grazing friends are not the salt of the earth. I am going to say they are not. They are no better than anybody else. They certainly have had a higher reward from this country than most people, and when the hon. member suggests that the graziers have done a fine job for this country, I suggest also that this country has done a very fine job indeed for the graziers. Again, it is only of recent years that the grazier has been showing any interest in providing fodder for stock and it is very nice to see that he is realising that there is an economic as well as humanitarian benefit to be gained from it.

I listened in the Longreach Club to an argument between groups of graziers. Those who fed their stock were being laughed at by the others who had allowed their stock to die right out. The were told what damn fools they were putting money into maize and lucerne for feeding to the damned stock. This was in 1927 and reports of it may be seen in the newspapers, in the Rockhampton "Bulletin" in particular. At that time, while they were neglecting to feed their stock and paying the lousy wages given to station hands then, some of those who were growling were racing horses in Sydney and Melbourne. It was said quite openly what a fool thing it was to attempt to feed stock.

**Mr. Sparkes:** And it sometimes did not pay. Men went broke feeding stock in the 1902 drought.

**Mr. HANLON:** The ones who did feed in that drought went broke. What a callous attitude it is to let cattle die! Provision had not been made beforehand. The grazier of today is taking an interest in these matters, notwithstanding all the bellowsings of the hon. member for Aubigny. The grazier of today is interested in providing food in advance—not waiting for the drought to hit him and when it comes saying he has no feed and asking the Government to tax the people to carry his cattle or sheep free. His attitude is, "I will not feed my stock unless you bring lucerne to me at starving-stock rates; carry my starving stock at reduced rates." The logical thing is to make provision in advance.

**Mr. Sparkes:** Come out and have a go.

**Mr. HANLON:** I have no need. My office is here and the hon. member's occupation is here. He is paid to be here, and he should attend to this business and understand that as a member of Parliament his obligation is to the community and not the grazier.

**Mr. Sparkes:** They are part of the community.

**Mr. HANLON:** They are not the whole of the community. It is splendid to see that the grazier is realising that he can minimise losses and that he can provide feed for use in a bad year.

**Mr. Sparkes** interjected.

**Mr. HANLON:** I am telling the hon. member what is factual; he knows it. The grazier today is interested in providing feed in advance. He is not trying to provide fodder after the drought arrives. If the hon. member thinks back he will remember the story in the Old Testament about Pharaoh seeing the fat kine first and when Joseph interpreted the dream it meant that there would be seven fat years to make provision for seven lean years. The attitude here has been to wait for the lean time to come before attempting to feed, and I think that every hon. member of my Government is pleased to see that in Queensland a change is taking place and graziers are showing an interest in providing fodder in advance. I know it is not going to be an easy job, and I know that there are many big areas in Queensland where there is not sufficient rainfall to make it profitable to try to grow fodder.

**Mr. Sparkes:** And that is where the vast number of sheep are.

**Mr. HANLON:** Near enough there are areas where it could be grown and transported. I am not minimising the difficulty of the position, but I have complained that no attempt has been made to meet the position. There is a new interest in growing fodder where it can be grown, and this is very heartening indeed. As times goes on, when more water is dammed up, more fodder will be grown. There are lots of places in

Queensland where water can be dammed up and in time we can minimise the tragic losses in sheep and cattle that take place.

**Mr. Sparkes:** Connect up your lines and you might minimise the loss.

**Mr. HANLON:** I know the line the hon. member is talking about. The hon. member said that the value of sheep to be saved would pay for the line.

**Mr. Sparkes:** That is so.

**Mr. HANLON:** If that is so, why the need to carry the stock there? If the saving of the loss in one year would pay for the building of the line, would it not pay the graziers to pay full rates on stock and fodder?

**Mr. Sparkes:** The line does not exist. You are getting away from the question.

**Mr. HANLON:** I am getting away from the part the hon. member wants to deal with.

**Mr. Sparkes:** Unfortunately I cannot reply to you.

**Mr. HANLON:** The hon. member has not stopped replying since he came into the House.

I am drawing attention to the fact that the hon. member suggests that the people as a whole should build the railway so that he and his friends can have their stock carried free. If his story is correct, that the loss in one year would be sufficient to pay for the line, why should the graziers have any hesitation in paying the usual freight rate and so lift some of this burden from the necks of the taxpayers?

**Mr. Sparkes:** Will you answer one question?

**Mr. HANLON:** The hon. member seems to be conducting a quiz test—he has been talking for a long time. He knows as well as I do that he and his friends would use this line during a drought so as to have their stock carted free of charge and then in good seasons they would not pay a three-penny bit to the railway revenue in the carriage of any of their stock. The railway would remain idle. They want to be able to use the railway free of charge in their time of trouble, and that is the opinion of the Railway Department, and it knows something about the way in which the hon. member has conducted his business. That is all I have to say in answer to the hon. member.

**Mr. McINTYRE** (Cunningham) (8.7 p.m.): I want to correct one statement the Premier made in which he showed a complete lack of knowledge of practical farming. He made a comparison between the crop harvested on the Downs and the sorghum harvested at Peak Downs. The information that he gave is based on entirely false premises.

**Mr. Hanlon:** It was supplied by the Department of Agriculture and Stock.

**Mr. McINTYRE:** If you are going to make a comparison with the amount harvested by each machine on a bulk crop you must take the whole crop into consideration.

On the Darling Downs summer crops are becoming very much a part of our farming activity and farming practice, so let me tell the Premier that in one year we harvested 4,000,000 bushels of sorghum, which is about eight times the quantity of sorghum harvested at Peak Downs. We grow all kinds of summer crops that are harvested by machines and it is the common practice to have crop rotation. If the information given by the Premier is based on a comparison between the harvest at Peak Downs and the wheat harvest of Queensland, it is based on entirely false premises and gives false information regarding the volume of work done by the different machines. I could point to **many farmers on the Darling Downs** who concentrate on the growing of summer crops. I know of one man who harvested a 5,000-bushel crop.

That is all I wish to say in correction of that statement by the Premier. He said many other things that showed a complete lack of practical knowledge of primary production but that one point is enough to demonstrate how much astray he was regarding practical farming. I do not wish to digress by discussing Peak Downs in detail but there are many other points on which I could put the Premier right. His information was based on an entirely wrong basis and on wrong premises and if the information that he brought to the Chamber today regarding the discussion he heard at Longreach is similarly based, then we are justified in accepting it with a great deal of reserve.

**Mr. AIKENS** (Mundingburra) (8.9 p.m.): I hope that no violent objection will be taken to my dealing with the matter before the Chamber, the administration of the Chief Secretary's Department. I want to make some remarks concerning the appointment of justices of the peace, a matter that was introduced earlier in the debate by the hon. member for Cooroora. I was absent when he made his speech but I was back in the Chamber when the Premier replied to him.

It is well known, of course, that private members of Parliament are entitled to nominate a certain number of persons as justices of the peace, and that Ministers have an unrestricted right to nominate any number they like at any time. This is the point I wanted to stress. When a Minister nominates a person as a justice of the peace no inquiry is made into the character or background of that person. The Minister's recommendation evidently is a sufficient warranty of that person and he is appointed a J.P. He may have had a criminal record as long as my arm. I am not suggesting that the Minister who nominates him knows of his criminal record but nevertheless he may have one as long as my arm yet he or she is appointed a justice of the peace. But when a private member nominates a person as a J.P. that nomination is forwarded to the police officer in the district in which the person lives and he is called on to make a report as to his suitability or fitness. Many of the police officers have no political prejudice nor are they guided by bias. Quite

recently I nominated one of the most reputable citizens in a northern town in my electorate as a justice of the peace. On making inquiries at the Chief Secretary's office as to why the nomination did not go through I was told that the police report was adverse. I can only assume that the police report in that instance was adverse because the man is a prominent and a militant unionist. He has no criminal record. He is a fine citizen. As a matter of fact, he has displayed fine citizenship qualities on more than one occasion and at the present time occupies a prominent position in the sporting life of the town. It is to his eternal credit that he played a prominent part in the last railway strike without being involved with the law. I can only assume that the police officer who made an adverse report in respect to him as a result of his prominence in the strike was an anti-unionist of the worst type, and because that police report was not in his favour he has not been gazetted as a J.P.

It is quite right that if a man or woman has been nominated as a J.P. the Crown should take some steps to see that unsuitable persons are not appointed, but when a person is refused gazettal as a J.P. because of an adverse police report, the member who nominated him should be told of the terms of the adverse report so that the person can be advised and have an opportunity to take some steps to correct the impression conveyed by the report. I should like the Premier to let me and other members know why any of our nominees are not so appointed. I am sure all other hon. members are interested in this point although I do not know whether they have had the humiliating experience I have had. This person was a prominent citizen and was rejected as a justice of the peace simply because some police officer, to use the vernacular, had a snout on him because of his union activities. It is a tragedy and a travesty that any Labour Government should refuse to appoint a man a justice of the peace simply because of his union activities.

**Hon. E. M. HANLON** (Ithaca—Premier) (8.14 p.m.): I want to correct the statement made by the hon. member who just resumed his seat. First of all, police inquiries are made about recommendations of Ministers for the appointment of persons as justices of the peace, except where persons are nominated for official purposes. Quite obviously, if a department wants some officer nominated as a J.P., we do not get the police to inquire into their antecedents.

**Mr. Wanstall:** He is a public servant.

**Mr. HANLON:** That is so. Neither are police inquiries made into requests with respect to reputable citizens, or officers of the Commonwealth or private trading banks. These officers have to be made justices of the peace for the convenience of business. That is so, too, with some company officers. In these cases it is not necessary to have police investigation. During all the years I have been Minister I have invariably put on my recommendations "Subject to the usual

police inquiry" because otherwise it might be thought by the department that I did not want an inquiry to be held. If you go over the recommendations that I have made since I have been a Minister—and I presume my colleagues do the same—you will find the great bulk have the precautionary words, "Subject to the usual police inquiry." I should hate to take the responsibility of having nominated anyone as a justice of the peace who I thought would not measure up to the position. He may be called upon to do confidential work and to try his fellow men. If the police have an objection to any recommendation that is made, they are justified in lodging it. After all, the obligation on the police is to maintain law and order. If a responsible police officer, after inquiry, reports confidentially that he does not think a certain person is suitable for the position of J.P.—

**Mr. Brand:** They would have to give a reason.

**Mr. HANLON:** They would give a reason. I think that when you come to consider that such a big proportion of the public are justices of the peace, you will conclude that they have been pretty liberal or the people of Queensland are a remarkably well-behaved community because it will not be long before they are all justices of the peace. If the police object to a man in their area because of his conduct and they give an outline of it, the department will not sanction the appointment. With all the precautions in the world, we occasionally have to remove a name from the list; later on a nominee may develop bad characteristics, or something that was not known may be found out. Quite occasionally we have to remove names from the lists of justices of the peace. It is necessary that we should do so. Taking it by and large, I do not think the department has been too hard when you consider the numbers that are appointed. There must be 20,400 of them and they are nominating at the rate of about 900 a year.

**Mr. Low:** How do you know they are all alive?

**Mr. HANLON:** We presume they are. We have not had any notification of their death; we do not go out and muster them. (Laughter.)

**Mr. Brand:** You would not allow a policeman to turn him down because he was a unionist. That is the argument put up.

**Mr. HANLON:** No-one would suspect the present Government of penalising a man for being a unionist. Being a unionist would not excuse anyone for being a law-breaker. Being a member of a union is a fine qualification for a man who is a good citizen. Joining a union, if a man is not a good citizen, does not make him a good citizen.

**Mr. Muller:** I am a member of a union myself.

**Mr. HANLON:** I am sorry to hear that. (Laughter.) Being a member of a union does not excuse bad conduct. We always



regard a man who is a member of a trade union as being quite a decent bloke; at the same time, quite a lot of them do get into trouble. I am reminded by one of my officers that there is a periodical revision of justices of the peace; one is being made at the present time. They give them a periodical check-over. As far as possible the list is kept reasonably clean. As I say, a policeman may report on a man and not know altogether his previous history; he may come from some other place. We have on occasions delayed the appointment to the position of justice of the peace of people who were not long in the State. A person may come in from some other place and see a member and he sends in a recommendation and we say that we will wait till we hear a bit more—let him rest for a while and put him on a later list. I do not think we should make an appointment without bothering about a man's character.

**Mr. MULLER** (Fassifern) (8.20 p.m.): The Premier introduced three very important subjects. First of all, there was water conservation.

**Mr. Hanlon:** I did not introduce it.

**Mr. MULLER:** He stoked it. The Premier dealt very fully with the justification for the Burdekin dam. The second important question introduced by the Premier was fodder conservation and soundness of storing feed to tide herds over dry periods. This is a very important question. The other question he discussed very fully was justification for socialised farming or the establishment of Peak Downs, whichever one prefers to call it.

To deal first with water conservation; the Premier, in reply to an interjection this afternoon, said that the Burdekin dam would cost approximately £29,000,000. That would mean, in round figures, a cost of £30,000,000.

**Mr. Hanlon:** That is the estimate. Probably it will cost more.

**Mr. MULLER:** In a big scheme like that no-one can estimate to within £4,000,000 or £5,000,000. But I have not risen to examine the Burdekin scheme at all. Although I believe that Queensland, with its varying seasons, is more or less dependent upon irrigation and conservation, I am very concerned at the spending of these very large sums of money on one or two particular schemes. Water conservation or irrigation, virtually the same thing, is dependent very largely on what can be grown and the accessibility to markets. The soundness of the schemes depends on these factors.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Premier dealt with the Burdekin dam. That comes under the control of Mr. Kemp, the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works. The matter of irrigation generally comes under another vote altogether.

**Mr. MULLER:** I accept your ruling, Mr. Mann, but I listened to the Premier with a good deal of interest this afternoon, and I

felt that, as the head of the Government responsible for work of this kind, had discussed it so fully I should be entitled to continue the discussion on the lines he followed. However, I will not transgress your ruling. I am prepared to discuss it at a later stage of the Estimates.

The Treasury is more or less dependent for revenue on the various agricultural industries and the Premier mentioned the storing of fodder to tide stock over bad periods. I take exception to the hon. gentleman's remarks about stockowners smiling at cattle dying. Nobody takes any delight in seeing his stock die. It is the economics of the question of storing fodder to tide stock over dry periods that counts. The Premier discussed this question from the value of the stock, suggesting that it might be quite sound to grow feed and store it to give one's stock when one's breeders are worth £14 or £15 a head. I am speaking of cattle; I have little or no experience of sheep. That is a totally different question from feeding the fodder when breeders are worth only £3 or £4 a head, and they have been worth only that over a period of years. It is not a question of the owner's wishing to see the stock die or not to see them die. What the hon. gentleman said is perfectly true—I noticed that he was looking very hard at me. I do not know whether he meant me, but if he did mean me, I should not object to the statement being charged to me as I have been guilty of something similar myself. I have been guilty: it was not a question whether I could bear to see them die but whether my banker would allow me to feed them to keep them alive.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Could you not get rid of them?

**Mr. MULLER:** Of course. That is the point. You have to know this business to appreciate what it means. There are dry periods when probably you could get rid of them at a reasonable price. Today you can dispose of any old cracker beast so long as it can walk, but there have been periods when there were no sales for them, and no buyers, and they would eat themselves out in three or four weeks. In other words, they would not be worth any more than the cost of the feed it would take to keep them for three or four weeks, so that it would not be economic to feed them.

It may be said that the owner of the stock should grow feed and put it away. I realise that it is cheaper to have it on the property than to bring it any distance, but the point is that it has a value just the same, and the owner of the stock usually has many other things to do than growing and storing feed. He has to make a living, he has to pay interest, and he has to show a profit. Anything in addition to that can only be done in what time he has at his disposal other than what he requires to carry on his undertaking. This is a big and burning question, but I do want to be fair and agree with the Premier in saying that in many districts there are people who have a complex about certain things—for instance, they will say that you

cannot grow this or that—and I agree that this complex should be discouraged, and they should be shown that these things can be grown. But it is not easy.

**Mr. Hanlon:** It is not easy, but it is worth trying.

**Mr. MULLER:** It is impossible in many cases. After all, it is a question of economics, and nobody is going to feed dear feed to a cheap beast.

As to Peak Downs, I have felt that whilst perhaps it might have shown a surplus on its first year's operations, it is still doubtful whether it will be a success. I do not expect the Premier or any of his officers to prove by a balance sheet in the first year or two that it is a success or failure. That cannot be expected on any farm. They did not get what they expected in the first year at Peak Downs. We all know that climatic and other conditions interfered. My complaint is that the principle is unsound and there was never any need for the scheme. There is no need for the Government to enter into farming. Thousands of young men are breaking their necks to get onto the land. Only yesterday I had the sad experience of meeting two young men from my district whose land had been frozen for soldier settlement.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member is getting away from the matter before the Committee.

**Mr. MULLER:** It would have been very much better to make that land at Peak Downs available to men who are breaking their necks to go onto it rather than to embark upon socialised farming.

**Mr. BRAND (Isis) (8.29 p.m.):** At the outset let me say that the proposed visit of the Premier to London will be very important for Queensland and her industries, and he is to be complimented on the fact that the Prime Minister has asked him to represent the Commonwealth Government at a very important Empire conference in Britain affecting the people of Australia. His visit will be important in that he will continue discussions with Empire Ministers or Premiers that will have an important effect on the future of the great sugar industry of Queensland.

Whilst the Estimates of the Premier's Department are under discussion hon. members might take the opportunity of suggesting that during his visit to England he will not only consider it his duty to give attention to one industry but will look after the many industries requiring attention overseas where the markets for our exports are important to production in this country. The Agent-General of Queensland has always been attentive to matters affecting the industries of Queensland, both secondary and primary. He has also been attentive in the matter of purchasing products necessary for our business life here.

In his annual report the Agent-General has indicated clearly that the discussions that will take place in the immediate future in London

will be of great significance in the life of this country. He has been the Commonwealth representative on the International Sugar Council, a council set up by world Governments for the purpose of protecting the sugar industry throughout the world. Because the war has thrown the International Sugar Agreement out of focus, much attention is now being given by sugar-producing countries to obtaining a renewal of quotas to enable those countries to know their position, so that they can continue with their production. In this connection I believe that the conference that will take place possibly late in November or early December, at which the Premier has consented to be present will be very important so far as export quotas to be made available in the future are concerned, and there should therefore be the best possible representation from Australia. The Empire is considering its own quotas of production and its own markets and I think it important that Mr. Pike, who has given close attention to this matter, is of the opinion that we should endeavour to obtain not only a British market for Empire sugars but also the markets of New Zealand and Canada. In this respect I believe the Premier will endeavour to secure within the ambit of the Empire bloc the whole of the Canadian, New Zealand and English markets for Empire sugar-producers.

Mr. Pike, in his last report has indicated that Australia, South Africa, the British West Indies, British Guiana, Mauritius, Fiji, and East Africa are all Empire countries desiring an outlet for their exportable sugar, either in the United Kingdom or in other countries within the Commonwealth.

I should like to emphasise the point that the sugar industry is delighted that the Premier has accepted the invitation of the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth to be present at the conference. The Australian sugar industry has been developed almost completely by the white race and in that respect it differs from every other cane-sugar industry of the world. Therefore, we should have an equal opportunity with the other countries of sharing the market within the British Commonwealth. It, therefore, is particularly important that Australia should be adequately represented at the coming conference, especially because recently other Empire countries, particularly the West Indies, have been making strenuous efforts to get greater quotas than they have at present on the markets in the British Empire. As the market in the United Kingdom is a limited one it is necessary that Australia should have a fair quota so as to be able to maintain a proper relationship between the other British Empire cane-sugar countries.

In this connection I should like to point out that the sugar industry in Australia and in Queensland in particular has been so developed since the cessation of hostilities that we can get back to our normal quantity of export of about 400,000 tons of sugar a year. Although the International Agreement is still alive, it must be pointed out that we have not been restricted to any quota on the overseas market, the British Government

having indicated through their Ministry of Food that they were prepared to take all the available sugar from Empire countries for a period of five years. However, the West Indies has been endeavouring to increase its quota by 300,000 to 400,000 tons so that if the International Agreement should be reviewed in the future she will on that account be in a better position to bargain for a quota than Australia is today. Therefore, the visit of the Premier to London holds out great possibilities for the Queensland sugar industry.

Other primary industries have been mentioned during the debate, notably the beef-cattle industry. I have no doubt that the Premier has read the report of Mr. Pike, the Agent-General, in which he says the position has been deteriorating in Great Britain and that there are great possibilities for the Queensland beef cattle industry there. I have no doubt that the British Ministry of Food will be pleased to receive any submissions that can be made by Queensland for greater exports of food products.

Hon. members have stated that there has been a difficulty in producing the quantity of beef desired, particularly because of weather conditions. The beef-cattle industry is one the Government must be deeply interested in for it plays a very vital part in the life of the State. It is another industry the Premier can give attention to while he is in Britain, where he can see what the future of the beef agreement is likely to be. For the last three or four years representatives of the British Ministry of Food have been visiting this country seeking many products, chiefly beef products, for Great Britain.

The Premier should give special attention to the pig industry also. It can be made a very large one. From what we have heard of the price that Britain is prepared to pay for pig-meats a very prosperous industry could be founded here in pig-raising.

There are other industries that could command the attention of the hon. gentleman. He can find out what the future of the wheat industry is and what the future of the sorghum grain market is. We have heard much discussion on sorghum and its development in Central Queensland. We want to know what the future for that commodity is, as the price paid for it today makes it a payable one. If the present price continues it can be made a large and important industry. I do not know whether Central Queensland can produce sorghum but the Downs and its adjacent areas can produce very heavy supplies if a satisfactory market can be obtained.

Today markets are very important to the primary producers. We may be able to make long-term agreements for the sale of many of our products, which would be of advantage not only to ourselves but to the British people as well. This is an opportune time. The Premier as a representative of the Commonwealth Government, will be able to give added weight to whatever representations he makes and should be able to claim markets

for our products within the British Empire. We should at all times foster and promote markets within our own Empire. If we foster and promote those markets, we should foster and promote also the products that can supply the whole of the British Commonwealth. If we do that we shall have done a very great service and I feel sure the Premier will leave Australia very shortly with the best wishes of every member of this Parliament and the best wishes of all Queenslanders that his visit overseas will be a happy one for him and will result in agreements by negotiation that will be of great advantage to the whole of the people of this country.

**Mr. RUSSELL** (Dalby) (8.46 p.m.): I feel I cannot let go unchallenged the remarks of the Premier about the drought conditions of Central Queensland and the stories he has heard in the Longreach club.

**Mr. Hanlon:** I was a participant in the argument; it was not something I overheard.

**Mr. RUSSELL:** These things are foremost in the minds of the graziers because they had such a terrible experience in the Longreach district, where they went through a period of some six years of more or less drought. Some of these men, instead of being callous and hard-hearted, realised from bitter experience what the outcome of feeding sheep may be. I myself have had a good deal of experience in this respect and I point out that the policy of feeding sheep in those areas can be financially suicidal, no matter how you may desire to keep the sheep alive.

What happened in the Longreach district? After the 1922 high wool prices they entered a period of very severe drought, which followed a succession of good seasons of some 15 years. Many of the graziers, expecting a return of good seasons, entered upon the feeding of their stock. I think at that time they were worth between 10s. to £1 a head. Once you start to feed you cannot stop because the value of the food you put into the sheep must be added to the capital value of the sheep.

This was the position that many of the graziers found themselves in. The drought ultimately broke about 1928. The sheep were valued at about £4 a head and even more in certain cases. You know what happened in 1928. It was the beginning of the depression and the values absolutely collapsed and the graziers found themselves with sheep worth £4 in their books but actually worth only 2s. on the market. Those graziers have been working for the financial institutions ever since. Do you wonder that there is a certain amount of speculation in those areas as to what is the right policy?

My experience of sheep-feeding is that in those areas you have to start feeding before the sheep get poor. If you feed when the sheep have lost their condition your greatest loss will occur when it rains. What happened in most of those areas when they kept them going and the downfall eventually came? The sheep went down with it. If

you are going to feed you have to have a policy and start feeding before the sheep get poor.

**Mr. Hanlon:** You have to accumulate your fodder in the good seasons when fodder is reasonably cheap.

**Mr. RUSSELL:** One of the problems is that there are so few fodders that you can keep, with the exception of lucerne hay; that is the only fodder you can keep indefinitely. You might have to keep this fodder for 10 or 15 years. Lucerne hay is about the only fodder I know of that will not deteriorate. We have tried it in many ways. We have tried keeping nuts by sealing them up in tanks, but they do not keep.

The result of my experience is that the only thing to do in those areas such as Central Queensland is to shift the sheep. That is the policy I have always followed. I never feed sheep, for the reason I have given—that the cost may mean financial ruin. That is what graziers are able to do in the south-western division of the State where there are ways out. The people in the Central Division, who the Premier talked about in particular, could not get their sheep out.

The Premier asked: why do not they sell their sheep? The reason is they would have to sell their sheep before they get poor. That is obvious.

Let us now look at what happens if a man sells his sheep. If he puts the sheep on the market today at a market value of £2 a head, after having been breeding for some years it is likely that the value of the sheep in his books is something like 5s. a head. In that case he would make a profit of 35s. a sheep. With that on top of wool income today, one can imagine what the taxation effect would be. Taxation would take about 30s. a sheep, leaving the grazier probably with 5s. a head with which to restock. When a drought breaks, everyone knows prices generally rise. Having sold the sheep at £2 a head, one would have to pay £3 a head to restock. Where is one to get the money? Even if a man keeps his sheep and takes the risk, keeping his sheep to the point where they are getting poor, the damage is done.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Could he not reduce his stock as the season goes off?

**Mr. RUSSELL:** We do.

**Mr. Hanlon:** The major trouble is hanging on too long.

**Mr. RUSSELL:** I have told you what happens in the Central Division. Two commissions have recommended the Government to build the connecting line between Blackall and Charleville and the Premier's reply is almost famous; he said, in effect, that it would be cheaper to pay the graziers the value of the sheep that perished rather than build that connecting line. I just mention this to refute the hon. gentleman's suggestion that the graziers have been pursuing a wrong policy in this connection.

**Mr. Hanlon:** The hon. member for Aubigny suggested that the value of the sheep was greater than the railway.

**Mr. RUSSELL:** That is a matter of opinion. The value of sheep fluctuates and estimates for the railway also fluctuate.

In Central Queensland they are able to carry sheep very much more safely on the larger areas because they are able to move them about. Therefore when land is cut up for closer settlement the danger from drought is considerably accentuated. Closer settlement in a large proportion of the Longreach country is very desirable, but let me warn the Government that they will have to consider the question of providing better transport facilities. The need for constructing railway links is far greater when the country is cut into small areas than it has been in the past, disastrous though it was then, as was proved by the experience of those graziers to whom the hon. gentleman listened in the Longreach club.

In previous discussions in this Chamber, I have brought out the necessity for these railway links and I do not wish to repeat my reasons tonight. They are forcibly put in the commission's report and they are very true.

As I said before, my policy has been always to move the stock rather than feed them but that is not always easy, because of the difficulties of getting trucks and because of the way sheep and cattle are handled in transit. If you let stock get poor the railway journeys can be disastrous. I know of two cases that happened recently in which cattle had to wait for six hours in the sun because they were held up on the railway and that was far greater cruelty to the beasts than anything for which the graziers might be responsible. On two successive occasions engines broke down and the cattle just had to wait in the sun. This resulted in considerable loss.

The Premier mentioned the conservation of fodder. You cannot conserve it for the reasons I have given but we recently tried to buy feed at Clermont near the Peak Downs and could not. In this case I took cattle up and when I got them to their destination I could buy only 2 tons of feed, and that is as nothing for 1000 head of starving stock.

Those are some of the problems confronting the grazier and I know that conservation of fodder in the far western areas is not practicable under present conditions. We must have transport, and as the State has developed the Government have not given sufficient consideration to that point.

**Mr. BURROWS** (Port Curtis) (8.57 p.m.): It is evident that the Opposition cannot allow an opportunity to pass of criticising the Queensland-British Food Corporation at Peak Downs, but as usual they are concerned more with being critical than with being correct.

The hon. member for Aubigny, with the assistance of his leader, made what he thought was a good point when he said that the yield to the acre at Peak Downs would never be equal to that on the Darling Downs. I do not think that was ever expected. He was doing his best to quietly damn by faintly praising the Peak Downs project.

Of course, behind it all is the fact that the British people have selected a Labour Government. Because they have done that hon. members opposite think they should be starved. I venture the opinion that if hon. members opposite were on this side many of them would say, "We will punish them in Britain for having elected a Labour Government. We will not give them any food."

**Mr. Luckins:** What an outlook!

**Mr. BURROWS:** I do not say that is true of every hon. member opposite, but it does to many of them. When the sorghum plantation was first started hon. members opposite wore the knees out of their trousers praying that it would not rain.

The hon. member for Aubigny wanted to know why the Queensland-British Food Corporation had not made provision for fodder conservation. He said it had cattle there. It did have 10,000 cattle on 460,000 acres.

**Mr. Sparkes:** It still has them.

**Mr. BURROWS:** That works out at only one beast to 460 acres. Would the hon. member suggest there was any necessity to conserve fodder if he had one beast to 460 acres?

**Mr. Sparkes:** What a great admission!

**Mr. BURROWS:** The hon. member knows that a place so lightly stocked as that would not require fodder conservation. Hon. members opposite were criticising the Queensland-British Food Corporation because 10,000 cattle were put on Peak Downs, but the only thing that concerns them is that the corporation might come in and ask them for a mob of cattle for Peak Downs.

As to the statement that the Downs would produce more sorghum to the acre, let me ask hon. members opposite this question: what did this land cost by private treaty? It did not cost 25s. an acre, including improvements, and I should like to ask the hon. member for Cunningham how many farms he would buy on the Darling Downs for 18s. or 25s. an acre? The hon. member for Aubigny puts up a great tale for the cattle producer and wants world parity for his meat.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member is getting a long way away from the vote before the Committee.

**Mr. BURROWS:** The hon. member forgets that the sugar-producer and every other producer, except the cattle-producer, takes the Australian price for what is consumed in Australia but the crowd the hon. member represents wants the cattle industry to be put on a higher plane. That industry is the aristocrat of producers and for the cattle-producer he says that the Government should build railways.

**Mr. Sparkes:** No, to save the poor sheep from dying—what the Premier is worrying about.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. BURROWS:** If the hon. member wants to talk on the question of drought

relief and fodder conservation I put forward the suggestion that he ask the Government to impose a levy on the cattle and sheep men—the aristocrats of the producers today, the ones who are getting extravagant and luxurious prices for their products. How many of them are putting a bit away for the rainy day?

**Mr. Sparkes:** Chifley is putting it away.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the hon. member for Port Curtis to deal with the Chief Office vote.

**Mr. BURROWS:** I do not want to get away from the vote but when the hon. member for Dalby was speaking he said that if a man sold his sheep for 35s., 30s. of it would go in taxation. The hon. member for Oxley, who knows better, was prompting the hon. member for Dalby and leading him along in his ignorance.

**Mr. Russell:** Tell us about Caucus meeting last week.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! There is too much hilarity in the Chamber and I ask the hon. member for Port Curtis to deal with the subject matter before the Committee.

**Mr. BURROWS:** If the hon. member had any sarcasm to spare he would not be here. He would not be allowed into a Caucus meeting and if he ever did get in he would misquote the facts as he has done today.

**Mr. Brand:** Don't you like the grazier?

**Mr. BURROWS:** I do not like the bad grazier and I do not like the bad wool-grower. I do not like a bad man of any sort but hon. members opposite are their champions. Let them get up and praise the good grazier, the good wool-grower, and the good dairyman, instead of doing as they do—whenever a measure is introduced into this Chamber for the protection of the public certain hon. members opposite think it to be their bounden duty to get up and defend the man who wants to make no provision in time of drought or dry weather. They want world parity for their goods but they do not want to pay world wages.

**Mr. Sparkes:** He pays more.

**Mr. BURROWS:** He does not. The hon. member knows that if they wanted, say, the price the American producer got for his product they would not be prepared to pay the same wages the American producer has to pay. He wants it his way all the time. He wants the sugar producer to take a lesser price than he gets today for sugar consumed in Australia and that is the price the grazier would have to pay. He does not want to play the same game with his own product. There are many graziers who are doing a good job but some of them are not. Quite a number are prepared to take everything out of the land and put nothing back.

**Mr. KERR (Oxley) (9.7 p.m.):** This Vote deals with the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works and there is an item under contingencies for "Cost of haulage of galvanised piping by road and rail from Newcastle to Brisbane."

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Premier has already drawn attention to the fact that that amount was spent last year and is not included in the present Estimates.

**Mr. KERR:** They were not in last year's Estimates at all. The amount was expended last year and the amount is placed in the Estimates this year for our information. I would point out that an amount of £11,228 has been charged to Consolidated Revenue for the cost of this haulage but it should not be charged against Consolidated Revenue. There is no doubt it was used in house construction and how it got into Consolidated Revenue I am at a loss to understand. The capital cost of house construction is a loan matter or is partly subscribed by the Commonwealth Government. Why should this cost be charged against Consolidated Revenue? Perhaps the Premier will be able to explain the matter.

I have always regarded the Agent-General's report as one of the most important submitted to Parliament. Three or four years ago he referred to the shortage of sugar. I pointed out to the Government that they were reluctant to grant any further cane assignments. Subsequently a royal commission was appointed and it recommended that between 200 and 300 more cane assignments should be granted. The Government carried out that recommendation.

I regard the hon. member for Isis as the sugar expert in this Chamber, and I hope that some other hon. member will not think it temerity on my part to speak on the production of sugar. The Agent-General in his report says, *inter alia*—

“However, the overall problem confronting the world sugar industry today is that of supply in relation to demand. In some authoritative quarters it is suggested that there is a danger of excessive supplies arising in the near future, bringing about a serious slump in the world prices, as was the case after the first world war.”

The Agent-General is a far-seeing man. He is extremely efficient and has his pulse on the world's markets, particularly sugar. Returned soldiers who are being placed on sugar lands will be greatly concerned about the development and activity of the sugar industry.

The Agent-General proceeds—

“This opinion ignores various factors which, if taken into account and given due consideration in the framing of policy, whether in a new International Sugar Agreement or otherwise, should militate and guard against any depression of a serious character.”

He then goes on to say—

“To illustrate this point of view one need only refer to the fact that today insufficient food is being produced in the world adequately to feed the nations. In the inter-war years, vast numbers of people were living at or near starvation levels. Today the world problem is worse

because of the immense growth of population and the destruction and chaos caused by the recent war. The world population today is estimated at 2,200 million. The present rate of increase is about 20 million a year, largely centred in India, China, and other Asiatic countries. Sooner or later the depressed and under-nourished nations will no longer be content to live in constant dread of death from starvation when in other parts of the world they behold abundance of vacant lands and vast reserves, or potential reserves, of food which under a proper system of distribution would enable them to achieve a higher standard of living comparable with that of other well-nourished nations.

“The Food and Agricultural Organisation has recently published statistics showing the annual consumption of sugar per head of population in the various countries of the world.”

The Agent-General gives a few outstanding examples. I do not want to read the whole comparison, but if anyone refers to the Agent-General's report he will see that there has been a considerable falling off in the consumption of sugar per head in 1947-48 compared with 1934-38. For instance, the consumption in Austria has decreased from 42.8 lb. a head in 1934-38 to 19.36 lb. in 1947-48. The consumption in the United Kingdom has decreased from 108.02 lb. a head in 1934-38 to 77.66 lb. in 1947-48, or about 25 per cent. There seems to be some reason for caution in the development of further sugar areas in Queensland. On the face of the Agent-General's report the Premier will be well advised to consult with the Agent-General on this question, which is of great importance to Queensland. I hope that the Premier will have the position clarified, because if further assignments are to be granted, particularly to ex-soldiers, no further delay should be experienced in making them available, as it will enable those men to engage in the industry for a living.

**Hon. E. M. HANLON** (Ithaca—Premier) (9.15 p.m.): The hon. member for Oxley said that we should not have charged that amount of £11,000 to revenue. There is nothing else you could charge it to, because it was a loss.

**Mr. Kerr:** Why did not the Housing Commission bear the loss?

**Mr. HANLON:** Because the Housing Commission did not get the piping.

**Mr. Kerr:** Who got it?

**Mr. HANLON:** It was spread round pretty effectively. The Government got 700 tons, 150 tons went to the local authorities, about 100 tons to the gas companies, and the balance to the merchants—and that went to the farmers and other people.

**An Opposition Member:** You did not charge for that?

**Mr. HANLON:** We bore the loss. We were not going to allow any new price on a line of piping that was unidentifiable as having come by road.

**Mr. Brand:** You would allow the freight charges?

**Mr. HANLON:** You could not take one piece of pipe and distinguish it from another. The attempt the Prices Branch was making was to prevent unscrupulous traders from bringing one ton of it up by road and 50 tons by boat and then charging 51 tons at the road price. Now it can come up by road if you got permission from the Co-ordinator-General's Department and the Building Materials Control Branch. We have to know where the piping is going. We got the opportunity of getting 2,500 tons, which had not been allocated to us but was cluttering the works down there, and we grabbed it. It was brought up by road at that cost and we had to bear the loss, otherwise we should be running round to see whether it went to the farmer or a gas company or the man who was getting water connected to his home or to the local authority.

**Mr. Sparkes:** How much did the farmer get?

**Mr. HANLON:** I do not know.

**Mr. Sparkes:** Not a large amount.

**Mr. HANLON:** 2,500 tons came up. The Government used 700 tons, local authorities got 150 tons and the gas companies 100, making 950 tons, so 1,550 tons went into general consumption.

**Mr. Sparkes:** How much to the farmers?

**Mr. HANLON:** I am sure none of it went to the confectioners. I have told you what the Government used—700 tons—and 150 tons went to the local authorities. Undoubtedly the hon. member would say, "Where was the local authority?" and if it was not his own local authority he would say they should have paid freight.

**Mr. Kerr:** Was any of it lost?

**Mr. HANLON:** I do not know; I never heard of any; as far as I know none was lost. We used what we needed for our own use—700 tons went to Government departments, 150 tons to local authorities, 100 tons to the gas companies to allow them to connect the gas to various houses, and the balance of 1,550 tons, roughly, went to the general merchants.

**An Opposition Member:** What did the general merchants do with it?

**Mr. HANLON:** Perhaps the hon. member knows some use for it that I do not know. I presume it went to people who used piping. They got it at the normal price instead of having to pay extra freight.

**Mr. Kerr:** I cannot see why you could not recover those costs.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. HANLON:** If the hon. member tells that to the Country Party members they will say that the farmers should have got it at the ordinary price. I am quite sure they will say also that the local authorities should have got it at the normal price.

**Mr. Sparkes** interjected.

**Mr. HANLON:** He got it at the normal price.

**Mr. Sparkes:** What sizes?

**Mr. HANLON:** Half inch to two and a-half inch.

**Mr. Muller:** Generally speaking, he got none at all.

**Mr. HANLON:** What else can be done with piping? It can be used only for the normal purposes for which it is used. The fact is that 1,550 tons went to the merchants. What the merchants did with it I do not know. It went to them and went into consumption at the ordinary price. Somebody got it.

**Mr. Sparkes:** The merchant was not allowed to charge for the road transport?

**Mr. HANLON:** He was not allowed to charge any more than the normal price.

**Mr. Brand:** He was allowed the freight that he would have paid had it been brought by boat.

**Mr. HANLON:** He was allowed to charge the normal price had he brought it by boat. If anyone finds fault with having saved the local authority excess price and saving the general consumer the excess price, well, I do not know what is biting hon. members opposite.

**Mr. Sparkes:** We have complained that more was not allowed to come by road.

**Mr. HANLON:** It is impossible to meet the hon. member tonight. First of all he objects to its being brought up and now he says, "Why do you not let more of it come up?" It is beyond me.

**Mr. SPARKES (Aubigny) (9.22 p.m.):** The Premier has explained the position as to the piping. The farmer has no objection at any time to paying the freight, as the piping is so urgently required. He would be quite happy to do so. The farmers are very thankful that there is one practical man who sees the position from the farmers' point of view.

The thing that has been worrying the people of Brisbane, the Government and everybody else is the high price of meat. The Premier will admit that. The Premier suggested the conservation of fodder to save stock but the hon. member for Port Curtis states that what the producer should do is to do what is being done at Peak Downs—460 acres to the beast and the cost of the land 25s. an acre. Allowing £28 for interest on capital and taking ordinary working expenses it would mean that the cost of placing a bullock on the Brisbane market would be about £50. The hon. member for Port Curtis has found out something. He said members of the Opposition did not know how to run their properties and that suggestion was his idea of the way to run them.

**Mr. Hilton:** You are distorting his statement.

**Mr. SPARKES:** I am not. The hon. member for Port Curtis said, 460 acres to the beast—that that was the way to stock the land.

**Mr. Hilton:** He did not.

**Mr. SPARKES:** Hon. members on this side heard him and I interjected that the hon. member for Port Curtis was going against the Premier. That hon. member said that if we followed this example we should have no trouble at all. What a wonderful discovery has been made by the hon. member for Port Curtis! How the Deputy Premier would relish meat on the Brisbane market at £50 a bullock.

**Mr. Devries:** You have been misinterpreting his remarks.

**Mr. SPARKES:** I am not. The hon. member said one beast to 460 acres.

**Mr. Ingram:** He meant 46 acres.

**Mr. SPARKES:** He might have meant 46 acres. What he said and what he meant might be two different things. I questioned it at the time, stating that the Premier had suggested conservation of fodder.

**A Government Member:** There is many a slip between the cup and the lip.

**Mr. Hilton:** He did not argue that as a permanent policy at all.

**Mr. SPARKES:** I am not saying whether he did or not. He said that was the way Peak Downs was being conducted. If the hon. member had been in the Chamber—

**Mr. Hilton:** I was here.

**Mr. SPARKES:** If the hon. member was in the Chamber he should have heard it. I suggest that hon. members on the Government side would be well advised to speak to the hon. member for Port Curtis, because if we are to run only one beast to 460 acres on land valued at 25s. an acre you are going to have very expensive beef. Again, as my leader points out, with closer settlement up there they will be running only about two beasts because very few of them will have more than 900 acres.

I repeat that no-one gets any joy from cruelty and any cruelty that does take place is absolutely unintentional. It is unfortunate, but these things are forced on the people.

**Mr. Jesson:** What are you stonewalling for?

**Mr. SPARKES:** I am not stonewalling; I am merely bringing this matter forward because the price of meat is of extreme importance to the public. Again, the hon. member for Wide Bay has reminded me that pork produced at Peak Downs would be very expensive by the time it got to Britain, if it was produced on the same lines as the hon. member for Port Curtis suggests beef should be produced.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. SMITH (Carpentaria) (9.27 p.m.):** I wish to deal mainly with matters affecting the North. The hon. member for Mundingburra said the other day that on his recent visit to the North the Premier said everything was well with the North. I agree with the Premier, and as the matter of financial aid to this State, whether for the North, South or West, must come through the Chief Secretary's Office I feel that I am in order in dealing with this matter now. I desire to take the opportunity of refuting many inaccurate statements.

It has been said that industrial progress in the North has been retarded. A perusal of the figures on page 6 of the report of the Director of Secondary Industries will disclose that industrial expansion in North Queensland over the last few years has been rapid. I propose quoting those figures because very seldom do we see complete reports printed in the northern Press. We never see anything in the Government's favour printed, whereas anything that may be said against the Government is given full space in the northern Press.

**Mr. Sparkes:** I notice that the northern papers featured you.

**Mr. SMITH:** Yes, because when I spoke of Northern Australian development I forgot that some hon. members could not visualise what I meant by referring to Northern Australia. They thought only of one small part of Northern Australia, the part occupied by North Queensland.

They did not understand what I was speaking about. I have been over the northern parts of Australia and I have personally travelled more of that territory than the hon. member for Hamilton. He keeps to Queen's road, Ascot, or Toorak road, and thinks he is looking over the whole of Queensland.

I am about to quote a series of figures for the purpose of having them included in "Hansard" so that people of the North will be able to read them. I understand that certain members of Parliament are sending copies of "Hansard" to the secretary of the North Queensland Development League. As Mr. Lawrence always says "Let us quote figures," I will quote a few figures to show that North Queensland has made rapid strides:—

*Population.*

—		1939-40.	1946-47.	1947-48.
Townsville	..	31,000	34,233	34,700
Cairns	..	15,200	16,641	17,100

I propose to quote the following figures in relation to the number of establishments—

*Number of Establishments.*

—		1939-40	1946-47.	1947-48.
Townsville	..	78	98	117
Cairns	..	47	48	58



Dealing with factory employment, the following figures are interesting—

*Factory Employment.*

—	1939-40.		1946-47.		1947-48.	
	Males.	Fe-males.	Males.	Fe-males.	Males.	Fe-males.
Townsville	1,277	139	2,409	134	2,357	160
Cairns ..	757	63	1,339	119	1,388	115

Here are some more important figures to be incorporated in "Hansard"—

*Net Value of Production.*

—	1939-40.	1946-47.	1947-48.
	£	£	£
Townsville ..	506,344	1,238,082	1,314,060
Cairns ..	350,475	694,382	750,245

Those figures deal with the industrial expansion of the North.

I have with me the official figures of the Australian Workers' Union membership in North Queensland and the Far North. I have not got the figures relating to other industrial unions, such as the Federated Engine-drivers and Firemen's Association, the Clerks' Union, and other unions, but if those unions have increased in numbers as the A.W.U. has, the north has made wonderful strides. For the benefit of hon. members I should explain that the Northern district is that part from Mackay to south of Cairns. For 1931-32 the A.W.U. had a membership of 7,094 members. In 1948-49 the membership had increased to 17,760, an increase of 8,666, or a percentage increase of 122.2. In the far northern district the A.W.U. membership in 1931-32 was 5,138, but in 1948-49 it had increased to 9,387, an increase of 4,249 or 82.7 per cent. Mr. Fallon, the branch secretary of the A.W.U., who gave me this information, advised me that the increase would be greater but for the shortage of man-power, and rather than hold up production in the North his union has allowed its members to work overtime in many industries.

When I made my previous statement about the North I got a telegram signed by certain people, one of them being Mr. Schrock, who speaks from the stump and over the air, advocating something for the North. He is a building contractor. The Government want to build two hospitals and nurses' quarters at Mt. Isa and Cloncurry at a cost of about £500,000. They cannot get any tenders for the work. If Mr. Schrock wants to do something for the North, why does he not submit tenders for these two hospitals? We need a hospital in Julia Creek and sewerage at Richmond and elsewhere. The Premier has given the assurance and has advertised the fact in northern papers that if any person will tender for these hospitals and sewerage schemes he will give them all possible assistance to get materials such as cement and reinforcing steel. The hospitals boards have called tenders for the work over the past three

or four years but no tenders are forthcoming. Why will not Mr. Schrock tender for these jobs in the North-West, involving £500,000? He has the necessary equipment and the knowledge but he criticises the Government for doing nothing. If the Government sent officers of the Department of Public Works to do the work by day labour they would be accused of nationalising the building industry.

**Mr. Sparkes:** Why do they not tender?

**Mr. SMITH:** They say they cannot get the materials, but the Premier has given his assurance, just as he gave his assurance to those who tender for the new railway station in Cairns. I did not see Mr. Schrock's name amongst the tenderers for the new railway station at Cairns but he sits in Townsville and criticises the Government for doing nothing.

Dr. Chapman criticised the Department of Health and Home Affairs for not installing an eye magnet at the Townsville Hospital. This man is in private practice but he wants the eye magnet installed so that he can charge patients anything up to 10 guineas and use the magnet at a Government institution to diagnose eye troubles or to draw steel and any other foreign body from the eye. Why does he not install one himself? He has been in private practice in Townsville for many years. He criticises the Government for doing nothing for the North.

Then we have the criticism of the president of the North Queensland Development League, who is also the manager of a big firm of Dalgetys Ltd. His firm handles paint, cement and all other building material. Why does it not do something to help the North by supplying contractors like Mr. Shrock to enable them to submit tenders for the construction of hospital buildings? Let such firms come and help the Government to do something to develop the North and not sit back in Flinders Street.

Let me give some figures with regard to cement. The quantity of cement supplied to places north of Mackay in the last four years are—

Year.	Tons.
1944-45 .. .. .	13,114
1945-46 .. .. .	16,384
1947-48 .. .. .	21,648

**Mr. H. B. Taylor:** Can you dissect what quantities were supplied to private contractors and Government works?

**Mr. SMITH:** The point is that cement went into industry north of Mackay. The controller of supplies would see to it that it went to contractors.

**Mr. Kerr:** If the cement is not there you cannot supply it.

**Mr. SMITH:** The point is that the sales of cement north of Mackay increased by 8,500 tons from 1944-45 to 1947-48. These figures are very interesting and that is why I mentioned them. Mr. Lawrence, the president of the league, said that they wanted figures quoted. The league also said that it wanted

an aerial medical service for the people of the North and North-West and asked what the Government were going to do about it. As Cabinet scrutinises the expenditure of public moneys and Cabinet is presided over by the Premier, I feel I am in order in referring to that matter on this vote, if the Chairman will allow me.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Hilton): I will hear what the hon. member has to say.

**Mr. SMITH:** I desire to reply to the criticism of the hon. member for Mundingburra that this Government have done nothing for the Flying Doctor Service serving the people in the North-West. For the year ended 30 June, 1945, the Government's grant to the Flying Doctor Service was from £800 to £1,000. After a deputation headed by Mr. Norman Bourke, the head of the Flying Doctor Service, at which the hon. members for Gregory, Warrego, Barcoo, and I were present, the then Secretary for Health and Home Affairs, Mr. Foley, decided to subsidise the service on a pound for pound basis. If hon. members turn to the Estimates for this year they will find that the Government's contribution to the service is £12,519.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member is getting too far away from the vote before the Committee.

**Mr. SMITH:** These people tell us that the Government are doing nothing for the service when their contribution towards it this year amounts to £12,519.

I wish to deal now with the hon. member's statement as far as the Bush Children's Health Scheme is concerned. He read out a statement about malnutrition amongst the children from the North and the North-west. The hon. member did not say what percentage of children came in suffering from malnutrition. I have heard and read reports in the Press that have been very misleading. One report was to the effect that children in the Peninsula and Gulf country had never seen a shop or factory or manufactured toys. That is one of the worst fabrications that I ever heard. I have read in the Press that certain children from the West never saw fruit or ice cream. There are not many children—so few that you could count them on the fingers of your two hands—who have not seen those commodities. I give credit to the people concerned with the Bush Children's Health Scheme, the object of which is to bring children suffering from malnutrition and poor health and trachoma of the eyes for treatment. I know parents of good financial means who send their children to the seaside resorts under the Bush Children's Health Scheme, but these gentlemen say they bring these children from the West because they suffer from malnutrition and eye diseases. If the scheme was carried out in its entirety very few children would come from the West to the coast area because we have a system to help these children in the West. We must refute the statement of hon. members, who do not know what they are talking about. I

refer to the statement made by the Secretary for Public Instruction that it is time they brought children from the coast areas into the country to see how they are fed there. It would be a good idea to take people like hon. members opposite to the West to see how the State functions. It is obvious that not only children should go to the West; hon. members opposite should go, too.

I heard hon. members criticising the Peak Downs scheme. Only a few days ago I spent a day on Peak Downs. I did not go there at the suggestion of any department or any Minister; I went there of my own initiative. I did meet the managers of the Peak Downs project but I obtained my information from the man there to whom I spoke who was the industrial representative of the men. This might interest the hon. member for Aubigny, who is a cattle man and should know that cattle will not fatten in the winter time or grow a winter coat.

**Mr. Sparkes:** Who told you that?

**Mr. SMITH:** The hon. member knows it as well as I know it.

**Mr. Muller:** It depends on what they are fed on.

**Mr. SMITH:** Yes. The stock manager of the Peak Downs scheme bought many head of cattle and placed them on Peak Downs after the crop was harvested. It was found in the recent winter months that these cattle grew a winter coat and fattened. The hon. member for Fassifern said it depended on what the cattle were fed. These cattle were fed on the residue of the harvested sorghum. These cattle will go to the meatworks and consequently expedite the shipment of beef to the people of Britain.

I was told also of an experiment in fattening sheep. A small number were weighed and put on sorghum stubble. It was proved that after a certain time the sheep put on condition. Is that not something that should satisfy us? In certain parts of the State I know that sheep will not fatten on Mitchell or Flinders grasses at certain times of the year but at Peak Downs this experiment proved that sheep can be fattened on the sorghum residue. As mutton these sheep can be sent overseas to feed the people of Britain and the starving people of the world. What has been done at Peak Downs shows that the experiment has been worth while.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. BURROWS** (Port Curtis) (9.52 p.m.): While I was out of the Chamber the hon. member for Aubigny made political capital out of an obvious mistake I made in quoting the number of cattle grazed to the acre on Peak Downs. No-one knows better than the hon. member that with one beast to 46 acres the place is lightly stocked. Again, there was the artificial feed in the sorghum stalks, grazing on which, despite the criticism of hon. members opposite, proved successful.

**Mr. Sparkes:** Would you say it was economical on Peak Downs to run one beast to 46 acres?

**Mr. BURROWS:** The hon. member was criticising the Queensland-British Food Corporation for not conserving fodder on Peak Downs. I pointed out that there was only a limited number of cattle and the place was lightly stocked and that in addition there was a considerable amount of artificial fodder in the shape of sorghum stalks. Hon. members opposite have stated that the sorghum stubble was not satisfactory feed, but experts have proved them to be wrong. As I pointed out, the hon. member in my absence wanted to make some capital out of the fact that I quoted an obvious mistake. I correct that mistake and still say that the place is lightly stocked, even with the sorghum residue there.

At 9.55 p.m.,

Under Standing Order No. 307 and Sessional Orders progress was reported.

The House adjourned at 9.56 p.m.

---